DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 953 EA 020 654

AUTHOR McCarthy, Martha M.; And Others
TITLE Under Scrutiny: The Educational Administration Professoriate.
INSTITUTION University Council for Educational Administration.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-922971-01-3
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 216p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, UCEA, 116 Farmer Building, Tempe, AZ 85287-2211 ($13.95).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Books (010)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Administration; *Graduate School Faculty; Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; *Professional Personnel; *Professors; *Schools of Education; Specialist in Education Degrees

ABSTRACT

This book reports the results of a comprehensive study of educational administration faculty conducted during 1986, which compares attitudes and behaviors of the 1986 cohort with earlier cohorts of educational administration professors and also compares characteristics of educational administration faculty with their counterparts in other academic fields. The first chapter provides an overview of the evolution of the professoriate across disciplines, the development of the educational administration professoriate, a review of the research, and a description of the design of the study. Chapter 2 presents information about the characteristics of educational administration departments, while the personal and professional characteristics of educational administration faculty are described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 discusses how faculty members spend their professional time, and chapter 5 describes their beliefs about preparation programs and the field of educational administration. Chapter 6 focuses on one subgroup: those who entered the professoriate within the past five years. Chapter 7 discusses indices of program quality and presents reputational rankings of educational administration programs. The final chapter summarizes the major findings of the study and discusses implications of the findings for preparing educational leaders. References are included, and instrumentation from the study is appended, along with tabulated data. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302953

UNDER NY:

The Educational Administration Professoriate

Martha M. McCarthy
George D. Kuh
L. Jackson Newell
Carla M. Iacona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Nash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 654

UNDER SCRUTINY

The Educational Administration Professoriate

By

Martha M. McCarthy
George D. Kuh
L. Jackson Newell
Carla M. Iacona

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

ISBN: 0-922971-01-3

First Edition
Copyright © 1988 by UCEA, Inc.
116 Farmer Building
Tempe, Arizona 85287-2211

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any other information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing

CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Preface iv

Chapters:

1. Introduction and Design of the Study 1
2. Department Characteristics 17
3. Personal and Professional Characteristics of Faculty 31
4. Professional Activities of Faculty 55
5. Professorial Values and Career Satisfaction 83
6. New Professors: Characteristics, Activities, and Beliefs 119
7. Indices of Quality in Educational Administration Preparation Programs 145
8. Change and Continuity in the Professoriate 161

References 177

Appendices:

A. Faculty Questionnaire 187
B. Department Questionnaire 192
C. Institutions in the Study's Population Grouped According to the Carnegie Foundation Classification Scheme 193
D. Department Questionnaire Response Rate by State 199
E. The University Council for Educational Administration 1986 Membership 200
F. Faculty Questionnaire Response Rate by Institution and State 201
G. Interview Data for Sample of Nonrespondents 208
H. Selected Discriminant Analysis Tables 209
I. Research Orientation Scale 214

FOREWORD

In 1973, UCEA published a book titled *A Study of Professors of Educational Administration: Problems and Prospects of an Applied Academic Field.* Roald F. Campbell, then at The Ohio State University, and L. Jackson Newell, then UCEA Associate Director, were its authors. The book was a comprehensive look at professors of educational administration and provided a basis for pronouncements on collective strengths and weaknesses, holding a mirror to the still fledgling academic speciality.

Twelve years later and a few minutes after taking the gavel of her 1985 UCEA presidency, Martha McCarthy talked to me about replicating the Campbell-Newell study. In her typical forward thinking approach, Martha suggested that current information on the professoriate might provide the basis for her presidential address in October 1986. I encouraged her, agreeing that it was time again to hold up a mirror to the professoriate. At the time, neither Martha nor I had any notion of the scope and complexity of such an undertaking.

In this volume, McCarthy and her colleagues do much more than replicate the earlier study. Indeed, the information contained here should prove invaluable to those making decisions about the nature of professional preparation for school administration. This volume helps us understand what must be done to renew the professoriate, shaping it to the needs of administrator preparation, and defining the appropriate place for educator preparation within the university.

How are we doing, as compared with 12 years ago? There is good news and there is bad. We are more productive as scholars; we have opened our ranks to more women and members of minority groups. On the other hand, we spend less time fulfilling our responsibilities of self governance, and, most unfortunately, we continue to be complacent, perceiving the need for reform elsewhere. Fear that efforts to make administrator preparation relevant to practice will destroy 30 years of progress toward legitimation of our scholarship still haunts us. Yet, what we should be most fearful of is our own complacence. These can be times for far-reaching improvement of schooling in America. The enthusiastic and careful shaping of administrator preparation and the professoriate can be enhanced by the data and observations offered by the authors of this book. I congratulate Martha McCarthy, George Kuh, Jackson Newell, and Carla Iacona, for this magnificent and timely contribution to the UCEA library.

Patrick B. Forsyth
UCEA Executive Director
June 15, 1988

PREFACE

Professors of educational administration play an important role in the education enterprise; they select and prepare most of the men and women who occupy leadership positions in educational institutions. How these faculty members invest their time and intellect should be of interest to those concerned about the improvement of education.

In this book we report the results of a comprehensive study of educational administration faculty conducted during 1986. In addition to comparing attitudes and behaviors of the 1986 cohort with earlier cohorts of educational administration professors, we also compare characteristics of educational administration faculty with their counterparts in other academic fields. This study is particularly timely, given the public interest in educational reform. Education has become a priority on most state political agendas. Numerous reform reports have emphasized the need for dynamic educational leadership, and the recent report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration underscored the need for changes in administrative preparation programs.

This project was initiated by Martha McCarthy when she was president of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in 1985-86. She invited George Kuh, also of Indiana University, to join her as well as Jack Newell, University of Utah, who with Roald Campbell had conducted the only previous comprehensive study of professors of educational administration. Carla Iacona joined the team as a research associate during her graduate studies at Indiana University and emerged as a full-fledged colleague as the study progressed.

As with other large-scale projects of this type, many individuals and organizations contributed time and financial resources to this endeavor. We deeply appreciate the assistance of four organizations that made this project possible. The University Council for Educational Administration sponsored the study and supported the initial mailing to faculty members. The Danforth Foundation provided a grant for coding and data analysis. Indiana University and the University of Utah contributed substantial support in terms of computer time, secretarial assistance, faculty time, and space for project operations.

The following educational administration faculty and educational leaders across the country offered constructive comments which improved the data collection instruments: Bruce Anderson, Larry Barber, Dean Berkeley, Roald Campbell, David Clark, Luvern Cunningham, Jack Frymier, Jack Greer, Daniel Griffiths, Barbara Jackson, Tom Jones, Ed McClellan, Cecil Miskel, Scott Norton, Patrick Forsyth, Martin Schoppmeyer, and Fred Wendell. We are also indebted to the insights Professor Donald Willower shared with us after reading early drafts of our results in preparation for a symposium on the professoriate at the 1987 meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Washington, D.C. While all these individuals and groups had a hand in this endeavor, the authors remain responsible for any errors of omission or commission.

A number of students at Indiana University provided assistance in coding data and preparing tables. We are grateful for the efforts of Elizabeth Agnew, Jayne Beilke, Carol Bobeck, Anthony Crull-Robertson, Gene Epple, Christa Gardner, Ruth Gibson, Carol Anne Hossler, Karen James, Shu Lyng Lee, Sharon Martin, Karen Paige, Susan Pleu, Justin Smith, Angela Stump, Scott Tarter, Palissa Williams, and Peggy Wyatt. Also, Elizabeth Whitt at Indiana University and Jim Brinton, Marcia Galli, and Tom Pederson at the University of Utah assisted in reviewing tables and making helpful suggestions on drafts of chapters. Special gratitude is extended to Jack Matkin, Jeff Woods, and Camillia Majd-Jabbari from Indiana University who provided invaluable technical assistance in analyzing the data.

The preparation of a manuscript with substantial technical material cannot be done without competent clerical support which we were fortunate to enjoy throughout the 15 months required to write up the results of this study. To the following individuals we express our admiration and gratitude: Ann Blanchard, Martha McGillivray, Kip Montgomery, Karen Paige, Connie Riggins, and Sandy Strain. We are also indebted to Rita Gnap and Charmin Smith at UCEA for their conscientious efforts in preparing the final draft for publication.

Without question, the participants in this study deserve a standing ovation. More than 1,300 professors completed the *long* faculty questionnaire; several dozen nonrespondents spoke with us by telephone; and almost 300 department chairpersons completed a second survey form. They took time from what we know to be very demanding schedules to tell us about themselves and the academic field of educational administration. This study is about them and, obviously, could not have been completed without their cooperation. We dedicate this volume to members of the educational administration professoriate, particularly those who are committed to examining problems in the field and to improving preparation programs through systemic curriculum reform.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 1 ❖❖❖

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A study of educational administration faculty is long overdue. The last comprehensive survey of professors in educational administration was conducted in 1972 (Campbell & Newell, 1973). In the interim, considerable interest has been expressed in the state of the professoriate across disciplines but little information has been collected specifically on faculty in educational administration. "If preparation programs are to improve, the professorship must also improve" (Willower & Culbertson, 1964, p. v). Thus, the primary purpose of this study was to gather data about the characteristics, activities, and attitudes of educational administration faculty members. A secondary purpose was to obtain information about the size, structure, and resources of educational administration units.

This study was conceptualized to replicate the 1972 study, supplemented with additional questions of current concern regarding what professors do and what they believe about their roles and preparation programs. To provide a context for the report, this chapter provides an overview of the evolution of the professoriate across disciplines, the development of the educational administration professoriate, a review of related research, and a description of the design of the study.

Evolution of the Professoriate Across Fields[1]

The activities and attitudes of faculty across disciplines have been a subject of serious study since the mid-twentieth century (Finkelstein, 1984). The professoriate in the United States underwent extraordinary expansion between 1950 and about

1970, gaining in esteem and fiscal support (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). During this period, more college-age individuals enrolled in postsecondary education, and this population grew as the post-World War II baby boomers moved toward adulthood. With the substantial increase in college and university enrollments, academic programs expanded at an unprecedented pace. Ladd and Lipset (1975) reported that:

> . . . the most dramatic faculty increases occurred in the late 1960s when professorial ranks swelled by 150,000 in one five-year span. The number of new positions created and filled in this half decade equaled the *entire number* of faculty slots in 1940. (p. 169)

In the 1970s, however, conditions began to change for the professoriate. Student enrollments began to decline, though not as sharply as expected. Competition for public funds among social service agencies resulted in other needs taking priority over higher education at the state level. Also, federal support for basic research and student aid began to erode. Many institutions of higher education encountered financial exigencies, and student tuition rates climbed, outstripping inflation. At some institutions, faculty positions were eliminated. Faculty salaries, which peaked in 1972-73, declined by about 20% in real dollars during the next decade, the largest decrease for any nonagricultural occupational group (Schuster & Bowen, 1985). Faculty retrenchment reduced mobility, and support for clerical assistance and faculty development activities was difficult to sustain.

It is not surprising that faculty unionism increased during this period. The promise of better working conditions and more equitable salaries through collective action had appeal in a period of contraction. Despite the apparent contradiction between unions' focus on collectivism and the value historically placed by faculty on individual autonomy (Ladd & Lipset, 1973), approximately one fourth of the faculty in American colleges and universities were unionized by the mid-1980s.

The depressed financial condition of higher education had the anomalous effect of stimulating research productivity on the part of many faculty members. Universities experienced a "buyer's market" and could selectively hire new faculty with an interest in and commitment to research. More rigorous selection, promotion, and tenure standards and the "research surge" (Schuster & Bowen, 1985, p. 16) nurtured favorable conditions for scholarly inquiry.

Civil rights legislation and litigation also influenced practices in institutions of higher education during this period. Some institutions faced court-ordered affirmative action plans to recruit and retain more members of underrepresented groups (i.e., women and minorities), and other institutions voluntarily implemented such affirmative action plans. Compliance with civil rights mandates became an important component of personnel practices.

As professors hired during the growth period reach retirement age, academe is entering a new phase that will be characterized by substantial faculty turnover. However, some scholars question whether capable individuals can be attracted to professorial roles to fill the anticipated vacancies (Molotsky, 1986; Schuster & Bowen, 1985). College freshmen today are less interested in faculty positions than

they were in the 1960s (Schuster & Bowen, 1985), and the number of PhDs aspiring to be academics is decreasing. According to Molotsky (1986), higher education will have to grapple with an "impending personnel crunch" as an estimated 70,000 to 130,000 new full-time faculty members will be required every five years from now until 2009 (p. 1).

At present, the professoriate is troubled. Faculty have been portrayed as demoralized and underpaid. Bowen and Schuster (1986) described American professors as "a national resource imperiled" and declared: "The financial outlook is less promising than at any time since 1955 and the conditions and expectations of faculties are correspondingly bleak" (p. 7). Preparing a new generation of scholars to respond to the pending retirement of perhaps half of the current faculty cohort by the year 2000 constitutes a significant national challenge.

Evolution of the Educational Administration Professoriate

To what extent does the condition of the professoriate in general describe educational administration faculty? Unlike faculty in many other disciplines, the educational administration professoriate has a relatively brief history because school administration emerged as a field of study only in the current century (Campbell et al., 1987).

Program Expansion

The growth of educational administration preparation programs has been intertwined with developments in the school administration profession. By 1939, most states had established minimum qualifications for school administrators; 40 states required a college degree and 32 required teaching experience to become a school administrator. However, only 19 states required school administrators to have completed graduate courses (Murphy, 1984). Requirements for school administrators changed substantially during the next decade. By the mid-1950s, 41 states required administrators to have completed some graduate work, and 26 states required a master's degree for administrative certification. These changes in certification standards nurtured the expansion of graduate programs in educational administration.

After becoming an accepted field of study at many institutions by the 1950s, educational administration programs prospered as the expansion of elementary and secondary school enrollments created a need for more school administrators. In addition, educational administration shared the benefits of the "golden era" of higher education during the 1950s and 1960s, when the number of faculty doubled and the federal government invested unprecedented sums in research and development activities. By the late 1960s, several hundred colleges and universities had established graduate programs in educational administration (Peterson & Finn, 1985).

As the educational administration professoriate expanded, the focus of administrative preparation programs changed. The practice of recruiting professors from the ranks of practitioners, who preferred teaching by anecdote and prescription

rather than by reliance on theory and empirical research, came under increasing criticism. During the 1950s, several interventions by foundations and professional associations emphasized the importance of improving administrative preparation through expanding the knowledge base. In 1950, the Kellogg Foundation supported the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) at five universities recognized as national leaders in preparing school administrators. Three additional CPEA centers were added in 1951. Subsequently, CPEA and the American Association of School Administrators cosponsored the Committee for the Advancement of School Administrators. The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was founded in 1954 and supported a three-year writing project designed to synthesize existing knowledge and recommend new directions in educational administration. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), a consortium of selected universities in the United States and Canada with doctoral programs in educational administration, was established in 1956 with a primary mission of improving administrative preparation programs through collective efforts. Drawing on the social sciences to illuminate administrative behavior, UCEA sponsored seminars, conferences, and monographs.

The Theory Movement

For those involved in the groundbreaking work during the 1950s and early 1960s, the so-called "theory movement" was a time of "high excitement, deep commitment, and shared goals—a period of expansion centered around efforts to build a discipline and achieve full academic acceptability" (Farquhar, 1977, p. 335). The theory movement was based on assumptions that (a) educational administration is an applied social science, (b) research should be theory based, and (c) administrative phenomena can be investigated empirically (Boyan, 1981; Halpin & Hayes, 1977).

However, only a small cadre of faculty at a few universities was actively involved in the theory movement. In fact, Hills (1965) concluded from a study of NCPEA professors that the "much discussed emphasis on research was more myth than reality," and that a relatively small proportion of educational administration faculty members was affected by the theory movement (p. 61). In retrospect, the origins of the theory movement preceded World War II, and its effects were not fully manifested until after some of its proponents had abandoned the quest for universal, empirically validated laws governing educational organizations. The changes associated with the theory movement probably affected the field to a greater extent than realized in the 1970s (Campbell et al., 1987). The movement's focus on organizational studies and the social sciences has had a significant impact on the content of administrative preparation programs, one that still persists today.

By the late 1970s, however, there was considerable disillusionment with the theory movement. Some scholars were disenchanted with the preoccupation with finding universal laws to explain what occurs in educational organizations. Theories grounded in logical positivism, which characterized organizations as having shared goals and rational, purposive behavior, came under criticism for ignoring crucial philosophical and value issues. The influence of external forces (e.g., unionism) on schools and questions of social justice (e.g., the underrepresentation of women and

minorities in leadership roles) were among the emerging concerns. Some felt that the theory movement had been misinterpreted in that the use of theory in conducting empirical research is not necessarily a quest for universal laws (Halpin & Hayes, 1977). Still others perceived a dichotomy between theory and practice that they considered counterproductive in an applied field such as educational administration.

Challenges to the classical paradigm in organizational studies became widespread, and alternative perspectives on the nature of organizations, such as phenomenology, Marxism, and radical humanism, gained popularity (Burrell & Morgan, 1980; Clark, 1985; Greenfield, 1980; Weick, 1976). Shared perspectives on research and organizations no longer characterized knowledge production in educational administration. Moreover, the field witnessed increasing faculty specialization and identification with subfields such as law, finance, and politics (Boyan, 1981).

The Era of Retrenchment

Demographic trends also had an impact on the professoriate in schools and colleges of education. Whereas, in the past, one third of all American college graduates and more than one half of female graduates assumed teaching jobs immediately after college (Mayer, 1974), the declining school-age population in the 1970s made prospects for careers in education look dismal. This situation depressed college enrollments in education programs, and with reduced credit hour production, the number of faculty members in schools and colleges of education began to decrease. Enrollment declines in teacher preparation programs preceded those in educational administration; by the late 1970s, however, most educational administration departments were poised on the edge of a precipitous drop in student numbers. Even though educational administration programs continued to produce a disproportionate share of education doctorates, the number of doctoral dissertations listed in *Dissertation Abstracts* with the descriptor "educational administration" declined steadily from 1980 (n=1,364) to 1984 (n=1,032).

As with other disciplines, selection, promotion, and tenure standards in educational administration programs became more rigorous during this period of contraction. Fewer faculty members were hired, but a larger proportion was involved in research (McCarthy, 1986). Knowledge production was no longer confined to faculty from a few universities, and some institutions that had not been traditionally known for their research mission appointed productive scholars.

Retrenchment, however, has taken a toll. In some units, the number of faculty members has dropped so that the critical mass necessary for high-quality graduate instruction no longer exists. In response to dwindling student enrollments, some programs became more "flexible" in admission standards and/or residency requirements. The quality crisis in the preparation of educational administrators was exacerbated by "mail-order universities" offering doctoral degrees in educational administration (Willower, 1983, p. 182). Furthermore, the focus on research in the university culture and reward system engendered a benign neglect of curriculum development and program innovation.

The Era of Educational Reform

In the 1980s, educational reform became a priority on state political agendas signaled by a plethora of commissioned reports (Stedman & Jordan, 1986). The first wave of major reports, beginning with *A Nation At Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1983), focused on the improvement of teaching and teacher education. The second wave of reform reports recognized the crucial role of educational leadership in school improvement efforts.

After a period of restricted outreach and reduced funding from external sources, UCEA has reasserted its leadership role in revitalizing administrative preparation programs. Recently, UCEA sponsored the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. The Commission's final report, *Leaders for America's Schools* (1987), has implications for university faculty and administrators, professional associations, and federal and state policy makers. The Commission boldly asserted that at least 300 of the 500 institutions offering courses in educational administration should eliminate such offerings because they do not constitute adequate programs. Other noteworthy recommendations included expanding clinical experiences in administrative preparation, involving outstanding practitioners in preparation programs, and adhering to a professional school model. The Commission also suggested that a National Policy Board on Educational Administration, with representation from major administrative professional associations, be established to monitor implementation of the Commission's recommendations and provide leadership to the field in policy development.

In light of the Commission's report and the increasing public interest in staffing schools with high-quality administrators, preparation programs are likely to come under additional scrutiny. To understand the present situation and to plan responsibly for the future, we need data on those currently in the professoriate.

Review of Previous Research on Educational Administration Faculty Members

The professoriate in educational administration has been the focus of episodic study for nearly 25 years. Several of the most important investigations are briefly reviewed in this section.

Hills Study

Jean Hills (1965), then of the University of Oregon, conducted the first noteworthy investigation in 1964 with a survey of 150 randomly selected members of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. The study was guided by three questions: (a) Was the rising emphasis on research in educational administration a reality or a myth? (b) Was the frequent talk about theoretical development fact or fiction? (c) Did the value given to interdisciplinary cooperation have any effect on faculty activities? From an analysis of the approximately 100 usable returns, Hills provided disappointing answers to all three questions. Although interested in theory, faculty were generally unfamiliar with the available theoretical literature. Further, when respondents from UCEA-member

and non-UCEA programs were compared, the two groups could not be differentiated on the basis of their awareness of research, theory, and interdisciplinary activity.

Hills advanced three explanations for the apparently negligible impact of the theory movement. First, most professors of educational administration still considered themselves generalists in the mid-1960s; indeed, the emphasis given to teaching and service activities essentially precluded involvement in research or theory building. Second, nearly 90% of the professors at that time had been teachers or school administrators and brought a practical orientation to their professorial role. Third, since the median age of the professors was between 45 and 49, most had received their education before the theory movement was well established.

Hills recognized that research demands a considerable investment of time; some projects also require substantial amounts of money. He urged that educational administration faculty be relieved of heavy teaching and service commitments so that scholarly renewal would be possible. Though modest in scope, the Hills study is often the baseline against which more recent information about professors is contrasted.

Campbell and Newell Study

With the assistance of UCEA, Campbell and Newell (1973) conducted a comprehensive survey of the educational administration professoriate in 1972. They sent a lengthy questionnaire to about 2,000 educational administration faculty members in the United States and Canada; 1,333 usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 68%. The study was organized around the following questions: (a) What were the personal and educational backgrounds of the professors? (b) What were the tasks and duties in which professors invested their time and resources? (c) What were the attitudes and beliefs of the professors regarding their own professional roles, their universities, and their academic field? (d) What were the "role orientations" of the professors; did they tend to be locals, cosmopolitans, or field-related?

The 1973 monograph provided copious descriptive data laced with commentary and discussion. The educational administration professoriate in 1972 was overwhelmingly male, Caucasian, of rural origin, and Protestant. The professors were highly satisfied with their choice of profession and remarkably complacent about its problems. Few were concerned by the conspicuous lack of women and minorities in their ranks. According to Campbell and Newell, most of the professors were occupied with such a diverse set of duties that serious and sustained scholarship was the exception rather than the rule. However, many faculty members expressed a strong desire to engage in serious scholarship, if their professorial duties could be rearranged.

Campbell and Newell conducted a factor analysis on role orientations and identified at least three subgroups within the professoriate. "Cosmopolitans" were highly involved in research and theory, enjoyed extensive contacts with scholars at other institutions, and had strong commitments to academic freedom. A second group of faculty exhibited a "local" orientation and identified strongly with their own universities, had especially close ties with colleagues at their home institution,

and spent more time teaching and advising graduate students than did their cosmopolitan peers. The cosmopolitan and local groups had characteristics similar to those described by Gouldner (1957-1958) and Clark (1963).

The third group consisted of faculty who maintained especially strong ties with practitioners and possessed a strong interest in field studies. The practice-oriented professors had comparatively weak ties with their universities and their research-oriented colleagues. About two fifths of the professors in 1972 could be placed in two or more of the role-orientation categories. Those clearly identified as cosmopolitan, local, or practice-oriented each constituted approximately one fifth of the total.

Campbell and Newell also found that many of the professors were assigned only part-time to the educational administration program, devoting the balance of their efforts to related departments or to university administration. Clearly, professors continued to bear heavy and diverse responsibilities in 1972. However, more faculty valued and were actually engaged in scholarly activity than was the case in 1964.

Newell and Morgan Study

In 1980 Newell and Morgan (1980) continued to track the evolution of the educational administration professoriate. A questionnaire, similar to the 1972 version, was distributed to a random sample of professors of educational administration, community college administration, and higher education (n=459). The higher education and community college findings were published (Morgan & Newell, 1982; Newell & Morgan, 1983), but the K-12 educational administration results were never reported.

Some of the unpublished 1980 data, however, supported several trends. A noticeable increase in respect for theory and commitment to research occurred between 1972 and 1980. The number of faculty who agreed with the notion that "scholars with specialized training in a related discipline make the best professors of educational administration" nearly doubled, with about two fifths of the respondents holding this view in 1980. Despite the economic and enrollment pressures facing universities in 1980, the proportion of faculty who responded positively to the question, "If you had it to do over again, would you still be a professor of educational administration?" was even higher in 1980 (92%) than in the 1972 survey (90%). The average age of the professors increased from 47 to 51 years; female and minority representation increased significantly. The 1980 findings suggested that more faculty were convinced of the importance of theory and research to guide the practice of educational administration and that the traditional homogeneity of the professoriate was beginning to erode.

Reflections on the Professoriate

In addition to empirical studies, philosophical treatises addressing the educational administration professorship have appeared. The Pennsylvania State University and UCEA jointly sponsored a career seminar in 1964 which resulted in *The Professorship in Educational Administration* (Willower & Culbertson, 1964). The

six contributing authors considered the recruitment and preparation of professors of educational administration, the professional work environment, the applicability of the medical education model, and the relationship between theory and practice in educational administration. Willower's concluding essay proposed the creation of a profession based on a synergistic interdependence of professors and practitioners which would create better understanding of each group's knowledge, values, and needs. Willower envisioned a more philosophical and reflective professoriate that would lead to better prepared administrators and, thus, better management of educational institutions.

Nearly 20 years later, Willower (1983) again reflected on the nature of the professoriate in educational administration. This time he was less concerned with the relationship between professors and practitioners than with the malaise among professors themselves. Troubled by the schism between positivists and phenomenologists that divided the field, he called for "a philosophical grounding for thought about the professorship and educational administration" (p. 179) and urged a more introspective, self-critical attitude about educational administration. "Whatever their particular philosophic views, individual professors should be able to employ in their work a broad thoughtful perspective on the world and on educational administration" (p. 196). Sensing that methodological disputes and economic and social conditions were artificially feeding dissension and despair, Willower appealed to his colleagues to take a new lease on their professional lives.

Other scholars also have considered the nature and evolution of the knowledge base and of doctoral programs in educational administration, with emphases on the professoriate. In particular, it is important to acknowledge the work of Silver and Spuck (1978), Miklos (1983), Campbell et al. (1987), and Culbertson (1988). Also, a personalized view of the development of the professorship since World War II is available in the full-length autobiography of Roald F. Campbell (1981).

Design of the Study and Methodology

As noted previously, this study was intended in part to replicate the 1972 Campbell and Newell survey of educational administration faculty members published by UCEA in 1973. UCEA also sponsored this investigation and provided support for the initial mailing. Indiana University and the Danforth Foundation provided support for preparation and analysis of the data. The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the characteristics of educational administration units (e.g., gender and composition of faculty, addition or reduction of faculty lines, faculty support and development activities)?
2. What are the personal characteristics of educational administration faculty members (e.g., age, marital status, parents' occupations)?
3. What are the professional characteristics of educational administration faculty members (e.g., employment history, educational background, rank, tenure status, level of concentration, content specialization, etc.)?

4. What portion of time do the faculty members spend in various teaching, research, and service activities?
5. What are the faculty members' perceptions of their roles, the quality of their preparation programs, and current issues pertinent to the field of educational administration?
6. What characteristics, activities, and beliefs distinguish various subgroups of educational administration faculty members? The subgroups include: (a) faculty with five or fewer years of professional experience and those with more than five years of experience, (b) male and female faculty members, (c) Caucasian and minority faculty members, (d) faculty whose concentration is K-12 administration and those whose concentration is higher education administration, (e) faculty employed at research institutions, other doctorate-granting institutions, and other comprehensive institutions with educational administration programs, and (f) faculty at programs affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration and their non-UCEA counterparts.
7. What are the trends from 1972 to 1986 in characteristics, activities, and attitudes of educational administration faculty members?

Instrumentation

We used two questionnaires to gather the data, a 45-item instrument for individual faculty members and a 10-item questionnaire for chairpersons of educational administration units.

Faculty Questionnaire. To facilitate comparisons of trends over time, we attempted to maintain the integrity of as many questions as possible from the original 1972 faculty questionnaire. We distributed the 1972 instrument to UCEA Plenary Session representatives in December 1985 with a letter requesting suggestions for revisions, additions, and/or deletions for the 1986 study. In addition, several members of the UCEA-sponsored National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration reviewed the 1972 instrument and suggested revisions.

Based on the data thus gathered and a comprehensive review of the literature, we made several adjustments in the instrument. We deleted some items that no longer seemed pertinent and added items to address issues of current concern regarding professors' activities and beliefs (e.g., use of qualitative research methods). A copy of the 1986 faculty questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

Department Questionnaire. We developed a second instrument for distribution to educational administration department chairpersons to gather information about: (a) department structure and size, (b) composition of faculty members hired during the past 10 years, and (d) support for faculty development and clerical services (see Appendix B). A comparable departmental questionnaire had not been distributed in the 1972 study.

Population

The population for the study was comprised of educational administration faculty members employed in U. S. and Canadian institutions with graduate degree

programs in educational administration. We identified these institutions using the *Educational Administration Directory* (Lilley, 1986), the *Directory of Higher Education* (Schorr & Hoogstra, 1984), and *Peterson's Annual Guide: Graduate and Professional Programs* (Goldstein, 1986). By telephone, we ascertained that the University of Chicago and Harvard University offered educational administration programs although neither was listed in the directories. Thus, a total of 372 institutions was identified; institutions that prepare administrators but have not established degree programs were not included in the population.

Of the 372 institutions, 79 (21%) were considered research institutions according to the Carnegie Foundation's (1987) classification of institutions of higher education. Designation as a "research" institution is based on number of PhDs awarded and the amount of federal financial support.[2] Sixty-eight institutions (18%) were classified as doctorate-granting universities according to the Carnegie classification scheme. These institutions offered doctoral degrees in a number of disciplines but did not award as many PhDs or receive as much federal research support as did research institutions. The remaining 225 institutions (61%) offered graduate degrees in educational administration but lacked doctoral programs or had extremely limited doctoral programs. Carnegie classifies these institutions as comprehensive universities and colleges. Appendix C contains a list of the institutions in the study's population grouped according to the Carnegie classification scheme.

To identify individual faculty members in the 372 educational administration programs, the directories listed above were consulted. A total of 3,087 faculty members were identified, each of whom was sent a questionnaire. Thus, the total faculty population was surveyed, as had been done in the 1972 study.

Procedures

Department Questionnaire. In January 1986, we sent the departmental form to the 372 chairpersons of educational administration units in the institutions included in the study.[3] Chairpersons were asked to provide data on faculty size, composition, hiring practices, and support services, and to advise their department members that the faculty questionnaires would be arriving within a few weeks. After one reminder mailing, 297 department questionnaires were returned for an 80% response rate. Appendix D provides the department questionnaire response rate by state.

Applying the 1987 Carnegie institutional classification scheme, 23% of the responding department chairpersons were from research institutions (n=69); 20% were from doctorate-granting institutions (n=59); and 57% were from comprehensive institutions offering graduate programs in educational administration (n=169). Fifteen percent (n=44) of the responding 297 chairpersons were from UCEA-member institutions. Chairpersons from 90% of the 49 UCEA-member institutions completed questionnaires (Appendix E). Of the 49 UCEA members in 1986, 35 were classified as research institutions (71%), and the remaining 14 were considered other doctorate-granting institutions (29%). Thus, substantial overlap exists between research and UCEA-member institutions.

Faculty Questionnaire. The faculty questionnaire was field tested at the University of Utah and Indiana University in January 1986. After some minor revisions, the questionnaires were distributed during February 1986 to 3,087 faculty members at 372 institutions with graduate degree programs in educational administration. Two additional mailings were used to increase the response rate: a reminder post card mailed 2 weeks after the initial mailing and a second survey sent 2 weeks later.

The directories reflected an inflated number of educational administration faculty members in that some people listed as educational administration faculty were no longer employed at those institutions or actually had primary assignments in other units. Respondents were asked to return blank forms if they had been incorrectly included in the survey population, and 331 did so. An additional adjustment of 415 was made after comparing data on the number of educational administration faculty members supplied by the department chairpersons with the numbers listed for those institutions in the directories.

Completed questionnaires were returned by 1,307 respondents for an adjusted response rate of 56%. Five questionnaires received after data analysis was under way were not included in the analysis. The response rate for the faculty questionnaire is reflected by institution and state in Appendix F.

We conducted telephone interviews with a random sample of 32 nonrespondents. Ten (31%) of these individuals did not consider themselves to be faculty members in educational administration. The other 22 had a profile of characteristics, activities, and attitudes that paralleled the profile of respondents (see Appendix G).

Despite the two additional mailings, the response rate in the 1986 study was not as high as the 68% response rate achieved in 1972. One possible explanation might be the more comprehensive mailing list used in 1986. Questionnaires were distributed to almost 1,000 more faculty members in 1986 than in 1972, even though professorial ranks have contracted in the intervening years. Thus, it is possible that more individuals in 1986 received survey instruments but were not professors of educational administration and, instead of returning a blank form, simply discarded it. Since the numbers of respondents in the two surveys (1,333 in 1972 compared with 1,307 in 1986) were comparable and educational administration units have decreased in size since 1972 (see Chapter 2), it is possible that a larger proportion of the total number of educational administration faculty participated in the 1986 study than in the earlier survey.

The percentage of faculty respondents affiliated with UCEA-member institutions was lower in the 1986 study than in 1972. Only 27% of the 1986 respondents (n=359) were employed at UCEA-member institutions, whereas 43% of the 1972 respondents (n=576) were affiliated with UCEA. Categorizing the 1986 respondents by the type of institution where employed, 35% (n=450) were employed at research institutions and 22% (n=292) were employed at doctorate-granting institutions. More than two fifths (n=560) were from comprehensive institutions.

Throughout this report, the participants in the study are referred to as "faculty members" or, collectively, as "the faculty." The term "professor" is also used in a generic sense to refer to individuals who occupy faculty positions.

Data Analysis

To facilitate comparisons between the Campbell and Newell report (1973) and this study, we computed frequencies and measures of central tendency for all variables on both the individual faculty and the departmental questionnaires. For most variables, we also computed descriptive statistics (i.e., frequencies and measures of central tendency) for respondents grouped by various characteristics (e.g., gender, level of concentration, length of service in the professoriate, UCEA affiliation, and type of institution according to the Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education). Where respondents were grouped according to their response to a particular item on the questionnaire (e.g., gender), we used the total for that item, rather than for the questionnaire as a whole. For example, the total of male and female respondents is seven less than the total respondents because seven individuals did not indicate their gender.

Using factor analysis (varimax rotation), we reduced the variables related to research, job satisfaction, and other attitudes about preparation programs to a manageable number of scales. Stepwise multiple discriminant analysis was used to identify the best set of predictor (independent) variables that distinguished between subgroups or dependent variables of interest. For example, to determine if the research orientation or job satisfaction of male and female educational administration faculty differed, we used gender as the dependent variable and entered items that comprised the research orientation and job satisfaction scales into the analysis as independent variables.

Similarly, we conducted discriminant analyses of pertinent faculty characteristics and departmental characteristics for the following dependent variables: (a) type of institution as defined by the Carnegie classification scheme (research, doctorate-granting, and comprehensive institutions); (b) level of administrative expertise (K-12, higher education); (c) gender and race; (d) years of service as a faculty member (more than 5 years and 5 years or less); (e) self-reported area of professorial strength (teaching, research, or service); (f) UCEA membership status; (g) perceived orientation of preparation program (emphasis on preparing practitioners, researchers/professors, or equally balanced between the two); and (h) program reputation.

Although each independent variable entered into the discriminant analysis would not be expected to discriminate by chance except once in 20 or more attempts, stepwise discriminant analysis does capitalize on chance. Therefore, some caution should be exercised when interpreting the results, particularly those variables with smaller discriminant function coefficients. Several statistics associated with discriminant analysis (e.g., group centroids, Wilks lambda coefficient) are explained in Chapter 2 where the results of the first discriminant analysis are presented.

If the relationship between a single dependent variable (e.g., job satisfaction of K-12 administration faculty) and a set of independent or predictor variables (e.g., attitudes, academic rank, salary, etc.) was of interest, we used multiple regression analysis, which yields two kinds of coefficients: (a) B weights which are unstandardized measures, and (b) beta weights which are standardized. As in discriminant analysis, the standardized coefficient (beta) is normally better suited

for determining the relative importance of the independent variables to predicting variance in the dependent variable (Tatsuoka, 1981). The adjusted R^2 represents an unbiased estimate of the proportion of variance in the criterion (dependent) variable (e.g., job satisfaction) accounted for by adding the respective independent variable to the regression equation. When the discriminant or regression analysis identified statistically meaningful relationships, we occasionally used additional statistical analyses, such as analysis of variance (ANOVA), to further illuminate the relationships between the variables in question.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

The chapters are organized to take the reader from general information about educational administration preparation programs to specific information about faculty, including those at highly regarded programs. To provide a context within which faculty activities and attitudes can be understood, Chapter 2 presents information about educational administration departments, with particular emphasis on changes over time in the number and composition of educational administration faculty at institutions with different missions.

To appreciate what faculty do, it is important to know who they are. Thus, the personal and professional characteristics of educational administration faculty are described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 discusses how faculty members spend their professional time, and Chapter 5 deals with their beliefs about preparation programs and the field of educational administration. These three chapters give particular attention to factors that distinguished various subgroups of the professoriate (e.g., women, minorities, those employed at research institutions).

Chapter 6 focuses on one specific subgroup, those who entered the professoriate within the past five years. Chapter 7 discusses indices of program quality and presents reputational rankings of educational administration programs. The final chapter summarizes the major findings of the study and discusses conclusions and implications of the findings for preparing educational leaders.

The results of previous studies serve as benchmarks for longitudinal comparisons and provide historical reference points which allow scholars to document the evolution of the field of educational administration. This study is another point of reference from which educational administration preparation programs and faculty can be viewed, now and in the future.

Notes

1. This section in part is based on the 1986 UCEA Presidential Address by the first author. See M. M. McCarthy (1987), "The professoriate in educational administration: Current status and challenges ahead." *UCEA Review, 28* (2), 2-6.

2. The Carnegie classification includes 10 categories. Institutions classified as Research I receive at least $33.5 million annually in federal support for research and development and award at least 50 PhD degrees each year. Research II, institutions also award at least 50 PhDs annually and receive between $12.5 and

$33.5 million in federal funds for research and development. Research I and II institutions both give high priority to research and are categorized together as "research" institutions in our study. The Carnegie scheme classifies institutions as Doctorate-granting I if they award at least 40 PhDs annually in five or more disciplines and as Doctorate-granting II, if they award 20 or more PhDs annually in one or more disciplines or 10 or more annually in three or more disciplines. Again, Doctorate-granting I and II institutions are grouped together as "doctorate-granting" institutions in our study. According to the Carnegie scheme, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I offer graduate education through the master's degree but very limited doctoral offerings, and enroll at least 2,500 full-time students. Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II may offer graduate education through the master's degree and enroll between 1,500 and 2,000 full-time students. For purposes of our study, these institutions are referred to as "comprehensive" institutions. Our study does not use the other Carnegie classifications (Liberal Arts Colleges I, Liberal Arts Colleges II, Two-year Colleges and Institutes, and Specialized Institutions), as no institutions with graduate educational administration programs fall in these categories.

3. "Department" designates the academic unit that offers coursework leading to a degree or certification in educational administration. Thus, the term includes different structural arrangements and represents divisions, programs, departments, and any other organizational unit in which the preparation of educational administrators occurs.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 2 ❖❖❖

DEPARTMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Institutions of higher education have evolved into complex, differentiated organizations. The departmental structure, because of its resiliency, has been criticized for fragmenting knowledge, blunting collegial interaction, and inhibiting disciplinary cross-fertilization (Davis, 1978). The department, however, has remained a vital component of the university:

> Academic departments . . . initiate most actions that affect the institution. They have the opportunity and sometimes the exclusive authority, to propose the selection or promotion of faculty members, and to suggest changes in conditions affecting the student in the classroom. At the same time, they carry out, properly or inadequately, the policies of the institutions (Corson, 1969, p. 92).

Since the founding of the first department of educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University 8 decades ago (Moore, 1964), the departmental structure has served as the primary decision-making unit for educational administration programs. As a primary workspace of the faculty, the departmental environment has an influence on productivity and satisfaction (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1983; Hunter & Kuh, 1987). Role satisfaction is believed to be, in part, a function of intrinsic rewards (McKeachie, 1983), such as perceived quality of colleagues (Locke, 1976) and students. Extrinsic variables, such as salary, resources for professional development, and clerical support, also shape faculty members' performance and their feelings about the workplace. Therefore, information about

departmental structure and faculty support may be helpful in understanding the context in which educational administration faculty perform and educational leaders are prepared. The relationships between intrinsic and extrinsic variables and job satisfaction are examined in subsequent chapters.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the number and size of educational administration programs increased between 1940 and 1970 (Miklos, 1983; Silver & Spuck, 1978). "During this time, the two year specialist program grew twenty-fold, the number of master's and doctor of education programs tripled, and the number of doctor of philosophy programs nearly doubled" (Miklos, 1983, p. 155). At the zenith, approximately 395 institutions had graduate degree programs in educational administration (Murphy, 1984). Another 100 institutions offered at least one course in the area. An era of financial stringency enveloped higher education in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Bowen & Schuster, 1986), and preparation programs have since decreased in size and number (Willower, 1983).

This chapter presents information about the structure and size of educational administration units, using data from the questionnaire completed by the chairpersons or coordinators of 297 educational administration programs. Comparisons are made with data reported by Davis (1978) on selected faculty characteristics and the types of degrees offered by educational administration programs. In addition to descriptive information, we used discriminant analysis to compare departmental characteristics by UCEA-membership status and type of institution (research, doctorate-granting, comprehensive universities) as defined by the Carnegie (1987) classification of institutions.

Departmental Title

Educational administration preparation programs appear in departments with many different labels. Among the 90 different titles reported, "educational administration" (17.5%) and "education" (17.5%) were the most common. "Educational administration" was also the most popular title at UCEA-member programs (18%), at research universities (23%), and at doctorate-granting institutions (24%). The comprehensive institutions had a wider range of department titles; "education" (25%) and "educational administration" (13%) were the most common.

About half of the responding department chairpersons indicated that the title of their unit had been changed during the preceding decade. Title changes were more common in programs at research (62%) and doctorate-granting (53%) institutions. A quarter of the departments with new titles incorporated the term "leadership" somewhere in the title; "educational leadership" was the most common variant (11% of all new titles).

Between 1976 and 1986, almost 40% of the units to which educational administration programs were assigned had been reorganized. The reasons for reorganization in research or doctorate-granting institutions were usually context-specific. For example, a few respondents reported that a new dean wished to reorganize the college of education. Others indicated that retrenchment "encouraged" new configurations of units which resulted in tying foundations or curriculum

programs to administration departments. In comprehensive universities, reorganization typically brought smaller program areas together under the aegis of a single administrative unit or, conversely, resulted in educational administration preparation programs becoming a separate administrative division.

Degree Offerings

The degree structure of educational administration units in 1986 was comparable to that reported by Davis (1978). The master's degree was the most common, offered by about 90% of the institutions (Table 2-1). The master's degree was the *only* degree offered by about 27% of the programs, in most cases, those at comprehensive institutions (44%) or those not affiliated with UCEA (32%).

Table 2-1 Degree Structure

	All Institutions		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Research		Doctorate-Granting		Comprehensive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Graduate Programs	8	2.8	0	0	8	3.3	2	2.9	1	1.8	5	3.1
Master's only	78	27.3	0	0	78	32.0	2	2.9	5	8.8	71	43.6
EdS only	4	1.4	1	2.3	3	1.2	0	0	0	0	4	2.5
EdD only	6	2.1	2	4.7	4	1.6	3	4.4	2	3.6	1	.6
PhD only	3	1.0	0	0	3	1.2	0	0	0	0	3	1.8
Master's/EdS	48	16.7	0	0	48	19.8	0	0	3	5.4	45	27.6
Master's/EdD	15	5.2	3	7.0	12	4.9	6	8.8	8	14.3	1	.6
Master's/PhD	8	2.8	0	0	8	3.3	1	1.5	3	5.4	4	2.5
EdS/EdD	3	1.0	0	0	3	1.2	1	1.5	0	0	2	1.2
EdS/PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EdD/PhD	5	1.7	1	2.3	4	1.6	0	0	2	3.6	3	1.8
Master's/EdS/EdD	36	12.5	5	11.6	31	12.7	9	13.2	13	23.2	14	8.6
Master's/EdS/PhD	13	4.5	7	16.3	6	2.5	6	8.8	5	8.9	2	1.2
Master's/EdD/PhD	19	6.6	7	16.3	12	4.9	13	19.1	4	7.1	2	1.2
EdS/EdD/PhD	2	.7	1	2.3	1	.4	0	0	1	1.8	1	.6
Master's/EdS/EdD/PhD	39	13.7	16	37.2	23	9.4	25	36.9	9	16.1	5	3.1
Total	287*	100.0	43	100.0	244	100.0	68	100.0	56	100.0	163	100.0

*Ten department chairpersons did not provide information about degree structure; thus, these data are based on only 287 rather than 297 programs.

About half of the programs offered an educational specialist degree (EdS). Seventeen percent offered both introductory (master's) and intermediate (EdS) degrees. The majority of the programs (52%) offered the doctorate. Forty-three percent were authorized to award the EdD and one third the PhD, an increase over the proportions (one third and one quarter, respectively) reported by Davis (1978). Less than one fifth (16%) of the units granting doctorates in 1986 offered only the PhD. Research universities and UCEA-member programs were disproportionately represented among doctorate-granting units (Table 2-1).

Thirty-one percent of the programs had comprehensive degree structures, offering the master's, specialist, and doctorate. More than a third of UCEA-member programs and units at research universities offered all four degrees (Master's, EdS, EdD, PhD), although only 3% of the comprehensive institutions did so (Table 2-1).

Composition of Faculty

The 297 department chairpersons reported that there were 1,619 full-time faculty in educational administration programs in 1986; 1,423 (87.9%) were men and 196 (12.1%) were women (Table 2-2). Minority (non-Caucasian) faculty comprised 8.3% (n=135) of the faculty; 109 (6.7%) were men and 26 (1.6%) were women. A comparison of the departmental data and information provided by faculty respondents concerning their gender and race is presented in Chapter 3.

Tenure Status and Academic Rank

Of the 1,619 full-time faculty members, 80% were tenured, with 60% at the rank of professor and only 12.2% at the assistant professor rank (Table 2-2). However, two thirds of the men and only about one fifth of the women held the rank of professor. While less than 9% of the men were assistant professors, almost 38% of the women were at this rank. Eighty-four percent of the men but only about half of the women were tenured.

Minority faculty were less likely than Caucasians to hold the rank of professor (42% and 62%, respectively) or be tenured (73% and 81%, respectively). Seventy-eight percent of the minority males were tenured compared with only half of the minority females (Table 2-2).

A gender-related distribution across ranks which favored men was evident (Table 2-2). Of the professors at full rank, 90% were Caucasian males, 4% were Caucasian females, 5% were minority males, and less than 1% were minority females (Table 2-2). In contrast, at the assistant professor rank, 54% were Caucasian males, 34% were Caucasian females, 8% were minority males, and about 4% were minority females.

The 297 department chairpersons reported that 141 faculty were denied tenure between 1976 and 1986. The average number of faculty denied tenure for all institutions during this period was less than one (.48, not tabled). Research (M=.77) and doctorate-granting institutions (M=.53) were more likely to report a higher number of negative tenure decisions per institution during the past 10 years than were comprehensive institutions (M=.35). Similarly, UCEA-member programs had more negative tenure decisions per institution (M=.75) than non-UCEA programs (M=.42). These data do not reflect many faculty who, because their performance was judged questionable by department chairpersons and other colleagues, were counseled to leave positions prior to the formal institutional tenure decision.

Departmental Size

In Table 2-3, the mean, median, and modal number of faculty by type of institution and UCEA affiliation are presented. The modal number of full-time faculty was 2.00; the average or mean number was 5.02, down from the 6.45 reported by Davis (1978). About three fifths (61.5%) of the responding department chairpersons reported five or fewer full-time faculty; 75 preparation programs (25.2%) had two or fewer full-time faculty. Thirty-two percent of the research

institutions, 58% of the doctorate-granting institutions, and 75% of the comprehensive institutions reported five or fewer full-time faculty in educational administration. Less than one fifth of the research (19%) and doctorate-granting institutions (15%), and only 5% of the comprehensive institutions had 10 or more full-time faculty. The two programs with the largest numbers of faculty were Canadian institutions.

Educational administration programs at UCEA-member institutions and research universities had about twice the number of full-time faculty as programs at comprehensive institutions. Although the average number of faculty at comprehensive institutions was 3.8, almost 40% of these programs had two or fewer full-time faculty assigned to educational administration.

Faculty Turnover

In a national survey of faculty, Minter (cited in Bowen & Schuster, 1986) reported that about half the respondents noted no change between 1981 and 1983 in the number of authorized faculty positions, with comparable numbers reporting increases (23%) and decreases (26%). Data from the 297 department chairpersons indicated that, while a majority of programs (about 60%) remained stable, educational administration programs as a whole lost faculty lines during the preceding decade. Between 1976 and 1986, a 2.4 : 1 loss/gain ratio was realized. In 114 educational administration programs, 278 positions were eliminated. In 58 programs, 116 positions were added.

A comparison of the number of faculty hired between 1976 and 1986 (n=930) with the number of 1986 incumbents (n=1,619) suggests that almost three fifths (57%) of the 1986 cohort were first appointed since 1976 (Table 2-4). These data may be misleading, however, as a single position may have been filled several times during the 10-year period. For example, if a unit with 10 faculty lines filled two positions twice during the decade, four recent hires would be reported for the 10 faculty positions. However, eight of the unit's faculty lines (80%) would have remained stable over the 10-year period reflecting only 20% turnover rather than 40% turnover in total unit lines.

The turnover information also overestimates the number of faculty entering the educational administration professoriate. Some faculty members may have been hired by two or more institutions during the decade. This is apparently the case for a number of female and minority faculty. Chairpersons reported that 307 women were hired between 1976 and 1986 but only 196 women were included in the 1986 cohort. Either women are unsuccessful or dissatisfied and leave the professoriate in numbers disproportionate to men, or they take positions at other institutions more frequently. Similarly, chairpersons reported that 127 minority faculty were hired during the 10-year period but only 135 minority faculty were employed in 1986. Therefore, the number of women and minority faculty hired since 1976 probably counts some individuals two or more times.

Table 2-2 Composition of Educational Administration Faculty in 1986 by Rank, Tenure Status, Gender, Race, Type of Institution, and UCEA Affiliation

	Caucasian Male		Caucasian Female		Minority Male		Minority Female		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Assistant professor										
Research	26	1.6	25	1.5	8	0.5	3	0.2	62	3.8
Doctorate	23	1.4	15	0.9	2	0.1	2	0.1	42	2.6
Comprehensive	58	3.6	27	1.7	6	0.4	2	0.1	93	5.7
UCEA	16	1.0	16	1.0	5	0.3	0	0	37	2.3
Non-UCEA	91	5.6	51	3.2	11	0.7	7	0.4	160	9.9
Total	107	6.6	67	4.1	16	1.0	7	0.4	197	12.2
Associate professor										
Research	110	6.8	18	1.1	12	0.7	7	0.4	147	9.1
Doctorate	84	5.2	16	1.0	11	0.7	3	0.2	114	7.0
Comprehensive	137	8.5	30	1.9	18	1.1	5	0.3	190	11.7
UCEA	73	4.5	16	1.0	12	0.7	4	0.2	105	6.5
Non-UCEA	258	15.9	48	3.0	29	1.8	11	0.7	346	21.4
Total	331	20.4	64	4.0	41	2.5	15	9.3	451	27.9
Professor										
Research	251	15.5	7	0.4	12	0.7	2	0.1	272	16.8
Doctorate	219	13.5	6	3.7	12	0.7	0	0	237	14.6
Comprehensive	406	25.1	26	1.6	28	1.7	2	0.1	462	28.5
UCEA	219	13.5	4	0.2	12	0.7	1	0.1	236	14.6
Non-UCEA	657	40.6	35	2.2	40	2.5	3	0.2	735	45.4
Total	876	54.1	39	2.4	52	3.2	4	0.2	971	60.0
Tenured faculty										
Research	272	16.8	20	1.2	19	1.2	4	0.2	315	19.5
Doctorate	336	20.8	22	1.4	21	1.3	5	0.3	384	23.7
Comprehensive	508	31.4	47	2.9	45	2.8	4	0.2	604	37.3
UCEA	276	17.0	17	1.1	21	1.3	4	0.2	318	19.6
Non-UCEA	840	51.9	72	4.4	64	4.0	9	0.6	985	60.8
Total	1,116	68.9	89	5.5	85	5.3	13	0.8	1,303	80.5
Non-tenured faculty										
Research	54	3.3	17	1.1	6	0.4	1	0.1	78	4.8
Doctorate	51	3.2	28	1.7	11	0.7	7	0.4	97	6.0
Comprehensive	93	5.7	36	2.2	7	0.4	5	0.3	141	87.1
UCEA	32	2.0	19	1.2	8	0.5	1	0.1	60	3.7
Non-UCEA	166	10.3	62	3.8	16	1.0	12	0.7	256	15.8
Total	198	12.2	81	5.0	24	1.5	13	0.8	316	19.5
Total	1,314	81.2	170	10.5	109	6.7	26	1.6	1,619	100.0

*Represents percent of total faculty (n=1,619).

Table 2-3 Number of Full-time Faculty Reported by Chairpersons of 297 Educational Administration Units

Number of faculty N	All Programs N°	%	UCEA N°	%	Non-UCEA N°	%	Research N°	%	Doctorate-Granting N°	%	Comprehensive N°	%
0	6	2.0			6	2.4	1	1.4			5	3.0
1	23	7.7			23	9.2	3	4.3	1	1.7	19	11.4
2	46	15.5	1	2.3	45	18.1	2	2.9	3	5.2	41	29.7
3	33	11.1	2	4.5	31	12.4	3	4.3	7	12.1	23	13.9
4	42	14.1	3	6.8	39	15.7	7	10.1	8	13.8	27	16.3
5	33	11.1	2	4.5	31	12.4	6	8.7	15	25.9	12	7.2
6	32	10.8	7	15.9	25	10.0	9	13.0	3	5.2	20	12.0
7	24	8.1	4	9.1	20	8.0	12	17.4	4	6.9	8	4.8
8	15	5.1	7	15.9	8	3.2	10	14.5	4	6.9	1	.6
9	8	2.7	4	9.1	4	1.6	3	4.3	4	6.9	1	.6
10	10	3.4	5	11.4	5	2.0	1	1.4	4	6.9	5	3.0
11	6	2.0	1	2.3	5	2.0	2	2.9	1	1.7	3	1.8
12	7	2.4	5	11.4	2	.8	6	8.7	1	1.7		
13	3	1.0	1	2.3	2	.8	2	2.9	1	1.7		
14												
15	1	.3			1	.4	1	1.4				
16	2	.7			2	.6						
17	1	.3	1	2.3					2	3.4	1	.6
19	1	.3	1	2.3			1	1.4				
*	4								1		3	
Total:	297	100.0	44	100.0	253	100.0	69	100.0	59	100.0	169	100.0
mean=	5.02		8.23		4.45		7.00		6.15		3.80	
mode=	2.00		6.00, 8.00		2.00		7.00		5.00		3.00	
median=	4.00		8.00		4.00		7.00		5.00		2.00	

*Represents number of departments indicating the respective number of faculty.
*Missing data.

Table 2-4 Educational Administration Faculty Members Hired in 297 Institutions from 1976 to 1986 by Gender and Race*

	Caucasians N	% of Hires	Minorities N	% of Hires	Total by Gender N	% of Hires
Males	545	59	78	8	623	67
Females	258	28	49	5	307	33
Total by race	803	86	127	14		
Total new hires					930	100

* Data supplied by department chairpersons.

Support for Faculty

The amount of money available to support professional development, typically for travel to professional meetings, ranged from zero to $2,000 annually; the modal amount was $300. About 11% (n=34) of the chairpersons who responded to this item indicated that their institutions provided no support. Two thirds of those not providing support were comprehensive institutions. In general, UCEA and research institutions provided more support ($385 and $421, respectively) than doctorate-granting and comprehensive institutions ($292 and $278, respectively). The modal amount of support provided by research and doctorate-granting institutions was $500. Only two UCEA-member institutions provided no support for professional development.

The modal faculty-secretary ratio in educational administration units was about one clerical support person for every five faculty. However, at research and comprehensive institutions, the ratio was about one clerical support person for every six professors. Faculty at UCEA-member institutions were advantaged by a 1 : 4 ratio.

Differences Between UCEA-Member and Non-UCEA Programs

Table 2-5 presents the results of the discriminant analysis of UCEA-member and non-UCEA departmental characteristics. The number of cases included in the analysis is smaller than the number of department chairpersons returning questionnaires, as some of the questions were not answered and, therefore, the cases could not be analyzed.

Discriminant Analysis

A brief explanation of discriminant analysis as an analytical method is warranted. In discriminant analysis, group centroids represent the most typical score for a group member. Discriminant function coefficients indicate for which group a score is most representative; the larger the coefficient the more common the variable is for that group. For example, in Table 2-5, the group centroid for UCEA programs is 2.11, and the group centroid for non-UCEA programs is -.42. Because the largest positive standardized discriminant function coefficient is .53 for the variable, "EdD in Educational Administration," this variable is most common to UCEA-member programs. Conversely, "EdD in Community College Administration" (-.60) would be more common to non-UCEA programs than to UCEA-affiliated educational administration units. Thus, variables that tended to be typical of UCEA-member departments have positive coefficients while variables typical of non-UCEA departments are represented by negative coefficients. Variables with smaller positive or negative coefficients are less potent indicators of group membership. The larger the coefficient, the more the variable discriminates between the groups.

The Wilks lambda coefficient shows the relative ability of the discriminant function to differentiate between the two groups. The smaller the Wilks lambda

coefficient, the better the variables predict group membership. For example, the Wilks lambda in Table 2-5 is .52 which indicates an average model. Table 2-6 presents a more robust model with a Wilks lambda of .34. Finally, the classification analysis indicates the percentage of respondents or departments that can be correctly placed in their respective groups.

UCEA-Member Programs

The departmental characteristics that were the most powerful predictors of membership in UCEA were: (a) an EdD degree program in educational administration, (b) doctoral programs in several areas including some PhD programs, (c) more white female associate professors, and (d) more full-time educational administration faculty (Table 2-5). Even though another distinguishing characteristic of UCEA programs was reduction in the number of faculty lines during the preceding decade, UCEA affiliates had, on the average, four more faculty than non-UCEA institutions (8.5 and 4.7, respectively). For example, while almost one third (32%) of the UCEA programs had 10 or more faculty members, only 7% of the non-UCEA programs had that many (Table 2-3). Almost three fifths of the non-UCEA institutions, but only 14% of UCEA-member institutions, had fewer than five full-time faculty members. Also, UCEA-affiliated programs had appointed more white women and more minority male faculty since 1976, had more white male professors with tenure, and were more likely to have doctoral programs in educational administration, higher education, and "other" areas (Table 2-5).

Non-UCEA Programs

Non-UCEA programs added more faculty during the past 10 years and reported more minority women and white tenured women. Also typical of non-UCEA departments were EdD programs in community college administration and special education, EdS programs in "other" areas, and master's degrees in higher education and special education.

Differences Among Research, Doctorate-Granting, and Comprehensive Institutions

To determine whether the characteristics of educational administration programs varied by type of institution, we conducted a discriminant analysis on departmental characteristics of research, doctorate-granting, and comprehensive institutions. Two functions were required to correctly classify 73% of the cases (Table 2-6). Almost 82% of the comprehensive institutions were correctly placed in their group compared with two thirds of the research universities and only 58% of the doctorate-granting institutions. Therefore, the results should be interpreted cautiously as the classification model is not robust, particularly for doctorate-granting institutions.

In the first function, positive coefficients indicated variables typical of research and doctorate-granting universities; the larger the positive coefficient, the more typical the variable was of programs at research institutions. Variables with negative coefficients were more likely to characterize educational administration

programs at comprehensive institutions. In the second function, negative coefficients reflect characteristics of doctorate-granting institutions while positive coefficients are typical of research and comprehensive institutions.

Table 2-5 Discriminant Analysis on Departmental Characteristics of UCEA-Member and Non-UCEA Institutions

Discriminating variables	UCEA (N=37) *M*	SD	Non-UCEA (N=187) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Faculty Characteristics						
White female tenured associate professor	.35	.67	.12	.34	.76	.32
White male tenured professor	5.18	4.11	2.53	3.08	.07	.23
Minority female nontenured associate professor	.02	.16	.02	.14	1.38	.21
White female nontenured assistant professor	.37	.59	.15	.40	.32	.14
Minority female nontenured professor	0	0	.01	.07	-1.77	-.12
Minority female tenured professor	0	0	.01	.10	-1.56	-.15
White male nontenured assistant professor	.27	.50	.27	.62	-.33	-.20
White female tenured assistant professor	0	0	.04	.22	-1.01	-.22
Minority females hired in last 10 years	.13	.34	.19	.43	-.64	-.27
Minority males hired in last 10 years	.54	.76	.25	.65	.25	.17
Degree Options						
EdD in educational administration	.83	.37	.34	.47	1.15	.53
PhD in community college administration	.32	.47	.09	.29	.87	.29
PhD in educational administration	.67	.47	.18	.39	.67	.27
EdS in special education	.27	.45	.09	.29	.83	.27
EdS in higher education	.21	.41	.09	.28	.76	.24
PhD in special education	.24	.43	.06	.24	.79	.23
EdD in higher education	.51	.50	.18	.39	.42	.17
Master's in higher education	.35	.48	.21	.41	-.39	-.17
Master's in special education	.18	.39	.19	.39	-.50	-.20
EdS in "other" area	.02	.16	.08	.27	-1.22	-.32
EdD in special education	.24	.43	.08	.28	-1.12	-.35
EdD in community college administration	.24	.43	.16	.36	-1.57	-.60
Size and Support						
Number of faculty	8.51	3.58	4.68	3.07	.09	.30
Decrease in faculty numbers over last 10 years	1.70	2.11	.71	1.20	.17	.24
Increase in faculty numbers over last 10 years	.29	.70	.49	1.10	-.24	-.26

Group Centroids	
UCEA	2.11
Non-UCEA	-.42

Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership	
UCEA	86.80	13.20
Non-UCEA	12.60	87.40
	87.35% of Cases Correctly Classified	

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	χ^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.888	.685	.529	133.20	25	.001

The best predictors of affiliation with a research institution were PhD programs in higher education, educational administration, and community college administration and a master's degree in higher education. The EdD in higher education and PhD in special education were more common in comprehensive

Table 3-4 Discriminant Analysis on Departmental Characteristics of Research, Doctorate-Granting, and Comprehensive Institutions

Discriminating Variables	Research (N=45) M	SD	Doctorate Granting (N=51) M	SD	Comprehensive (N=51) M	SD	Function 1 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 1 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 2 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 2 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients
Faculty Characteristics										
Number of educational administration faculty	7.12	3.53	6.35	3.22	3.86	2.66	.09	.26	-.04	-.13
Minority female nontenured assistant professors	.60	.91	.02	.14	0	0	2.00	.24	-.23	-.60
Minority female nontenured associate professors	.26	.51	0	0	.05	.31	.75	.11	2.18	.32
White female tenured associate professors	1.0	.43	.22	.54	.11	.33	.20	.08	-.65	-.26
Minority male nontenured assistant professors	.12	.33	.02	.14	.03	.18	-.02	.01	1.85	.41
Minority male nontenured associate professors	.09	.21	.08	.27	.01	.08	-.44	-.08	2.25	.38
White male tenured assistant professors	.09	.21	.08	.24	.13	.38	-.30	-.14	.23	.11
Minority male tenured associate professors	.11	.44	.14	.49	.03	.16	-.42	-.16	-.36	-.14
Minority female nontenured full professors	0	0	0	0	.01	.08	3.39	.21	1.15	.07
Degree Options										
EdD in educational administration	.77	.42	.65	.48	.13	.36	1.45	.51	1.11	.43
Master's in higher education	.32	.50	.37	.45	.08	.27	1.31	.50	-.49	-.19
Master's in special education	.31	.47	.12	.33	.01	.11	1.26	.36	.01	.00
EdD in community college	.40	.49	.16	.37	.03	.21	.90	.23	.47	.16
PhD in higher education	.52	.50	.16	.37	.05	.25	.81	.22	1.94	.68
PhD in educational administration	.55	.50	.33	.48	.03	.29	.55	.21	-.81	-.32
PhD in "other" area	.13	.34	.10	.30	.01	.10	.37	.10	1.09	.28
EdD in "other" area	.12	.33	.20	.40	.01	.21	.14	.04	1.08	.31
Master's in "other" area	.18	.38	.22	.42	.11	.31	.04	.01	-.73	-.28
EdS in educational administration	.55	.50	.55	.50	.42	.50	.50	.25	-.17	-.08
Master's in community college	.43	.50	.12	.33	.15	.36	-.01	-.26	.50	.27
EdD in higher education	.51	.50	.27	.45	.07	.26	-.74	-.27	.58	.21
PhD in special education	.23	.42	.06	.24	.03	.18	-1.05	-.28	-.51	-.08
Program History										
Number of faculty has decreased in past decade	1.54	1.90	.82	1.42	.70	1.17	.25	.35	.25	.35
Faculty numbers have remained stable	.28	.45	.41	.50	.40	.49	.30	.24	.08	.06
Number of faculty has increased in past decade	.48	1.12	.51	1.17	.36	.88	.13	.13	.20	.20
Number of white males hired in past decade	2.31	1.90	2.33	1.80	1.34	1.52	.09	.09	-.12	-.10
Dollars for professional development	424.38	291.10	285.24	208.02	262.57	240.71	.00	.00	.00	.26
Group Centroids										
Research							1.68		.49	
Doctorate							.02		1.05	
Comprehensive							-.93		.14	

Classification Analysis

	Percent of Cases Correctly Classified		
Research	65.2	15.9	18.8
Doctorate	18.6	37.6	23.7
Comprehensive	5.9	12.4	81.7

73.06% of Cases Correctly Classified

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks Lambda	χ^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	1.27	.75	.34	267.89	54	.001
Function 2	.38	.47	.78	62.70	26	.001

institutions (Table 2-6). Programs at research universities were also distinguished by the number of faculty (almost twice the number of comprehensive institutions), and changes in the number of faculty (either increases or decreases) between 1976 and 1986. Research institutions provided more support per annum for professional development ($424 compared with about $285 provided by doctorate-granting and comprehensive institutions).

Doctorate-granting institutions had more minority faculty at junior rank and offered doctoral degrees in educational administration and in "other" areas. Compared with programs at doctorate-granting institutions, research institutions were more likely to have a PhD in higher education.

Summary

Some things have changed during the past decade in educational administration units; many things have stayed the same. The degree structure across units remained quite similar to that reported by Davis (1978). Most programs offered a master's degree (90%). Almost half offered the doctorate, and half offered the EdS. As expected, doctoral programs were more common at research and doctorate-granting institutions than at comprehensive institutions. The most pronounced change since the report by Davis (1978) was the increase in the number of programs authorized to offer doctorates, particularly the PhD.

About two fifths of the administrative units to which educational administration programs were assigned in 1980 had been restructured within the previous decade, and about half of the units had changed their title. No one title dominated although "educational administration" was favored at research and UCEA-member institutions. It is not possible to infer from these data whether changes in department title were triggered by additional doctoral programs, associated with curriculum revisions, or connoted significant departures from routine practices in the preparation of educational administrators.

Substantial numbers of women and minority faculty have been appointed. Yet the overwhelming majority (87.9%) of educational administration faculty were men in 1986. Compared with women, a disproportionately higher number of men were tenured, a difference which is explained in part by the fact that many of the female faculty had been appointed during the preceding 10-year period and were not yet eligible for tenure.

The modal number of faculty declined since 1972. About half of the educational administration units had four or fewer faculty, and about a quarter had two or fewer faculty. Less than half of the programs had at least five faculty, the minimum number suggested by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Obviously, many programs do not meet the minimum faculty resource criterion, an issue that will be discussed in the final chapter.

In general, the characteristics of educational administration programs at research universities were quite similar to those with membership in UCEA. Even though they were as likely to reduce the number of faculty lines during the preceding decade, UCEA-member and research institutions had about twice the faculty

resources of programs at other institutions and provided more support in the form of clerical assistance and funds for faculty development. UCEA and research institutions were more likely to offer doctoral degrees in several areas, including the PhD, which adds to the perceived status of the unit on the host institution campus as well as in the eyes of peers elsewhere.

Since 1976, programs at comprehensive institutions have hired more women and minority faculty than UCEA or research institutions. However, educational administration programs at these institutions had relatively few faculty, four or less. Therefore, women and minority faculty at comprehensive institutions are less likely to have colleagueship, a factor that may have a negative influence on satisfaction and productivity (see Chapters 5 and 8).

The faculty role is labor intensive. As will be discussed in Chapter 4, the proliferation of doctoral programs has been reflected in an increase in the amount of time faculty devote to advising doctoral students and supervising research. Decreasing numbers of full-time faculty suggest that the nature and scope of activities performed by educational administration faculty must be modified to maintain quality in preparation programs and field services, an issue that will be addressed in Chapter 8.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 3 ❖❖❖

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FACULTY

Descriptive studies "map the field" of educational administration (Campbell & Newell, 1973), and are necessary to understand and appreciate faculty members' activities and attitudes. Because generalizations decay over time (Cronbach, 1975), periodic inquiries into the evolving characteristics of the educational administration professoriate are vital. Descriptive information about the backgrounds of educational administration faculty provides a backdrop against which characteristics of subgroups (e.g, women, younger faculty) can be interpreted and permits comparisons with faculty in other fields that are useful in assessing the extent to which conditions in educational administration are ordinary or unusual. For example, assessments can be made as to whether the educational administration professoriate is under- or over-compensated compared with faculty in other fields, whether female and minority representation is comparable to that across disciplines, and whether the field will experience the wave of retirements predicted for the professoriate as a whole.

Such descriptive information about educational administration faculty also has implications for recruiting the next generation of faculty, reform in preparation programs, and faculty development efforts, topics which will be addressed in this

and subsequent chapters. To provide a context for these topics, the following questions serve as organizing themes for this chapter:

Who are professors of educational administration?
Where are they employed?
What personal and professional attributes characterize faculty in this field?
Are educational administration faculty similar to faculty across disciplines?
Have the characteristics of educational administration faculty changed since 1972?

For some variables, all educational administration respondents are treated as a single group. For most variables, however, the respondents are categorized by gender, race, UCEA affiliation, and type of institution where employed (research, doctorate-granting, or comprehensive) according to the Carnegie (1987) classification of institutions of higher education. We also note differences in characteristics of respondents grouped by level of administrative concentration (K-12 or higher education) and compare our findings with comparable data collected by Campbell and Newell (1973). The data in this chapter are primarily reported using measures of central tendency. The discriminant analysis tables in Appendix H also depict differences in characteristics among subgroups of the professoriate as well as differences in activities and beliefs that are addressed in subsequent chapters.

Personal Characteristics

Gender and Race

We collected data on the gender and race of 1986 educational administration faculty members from two sources: (a) department chairpersons (discussed in Chapter 2), and (b) individual faculty. Of the 1,302 individual faculty members who returned questionnaires in time to be included in the analysis 1,160 (89%) were men and 135 (10%) were women; seven did not indicate their gender (Table 3-1). Female representation in the educational administration professoriate reported by department chairpersons (12%) was about 2% higher than the percentage of individual women respondents.

Female representation has increased more than threefold since 1972, when women comprised only 3% of the educational administration faculty. Department chairpersons reported that the increase in female representation has been even more dramatic among faculty hired within the past decade in that women comprised 32% of those hired from 1976 to 1986. Almost two fifths (38%) of the female faculty respondents indicated that they were hired within the preceding 5 years.

The categories used to record the racial composition of faculty were: American Indian, Asian, Black, Caucasian, and Hispanic. Eighty-six respondents (7%) indicated that they were ethnic minorities and 1,198 (92%) were Caucasians; 18 respondents did not indicate their race (Table 3-2). Although fewer than one tenth of the Caucasian respondents were women, almost one fourth (23%) of the minority respondents were females. As with women, minority representation among faculty respondents was somewhat lower (almost 2%) than the percentage reported by department chairpersons.

Table 3-1 Gender and Race of Educational Administration Faculty Members in 1986

	Data from 1,302 Faculty Respondents		Data from 297 Department Chairs	
	N	%	N	%
Caucasian males	1,082[a]	84.4	1,314	81.2
Minority males	66[a]	5.1	109	6.7
Caucasian females	115[a]	9.0	170	10.5
Minority females	20[a]	1.6	26	1.6
Total male	1,160[a]	89.1	1,423	87.9
Total female	135[a]	10.4	196	12.1
Total Caucasian	1,198[a]	92.0	1,484	91.7
Total minority	86[a]	6.6	135	8.3
Total faculty	1,302[a]	100.0	1,619	100.0

[a]Seven of the 1,302 faculty respondents (.5%) did not indicate their gender, and 18 (1.4%) did not indicate their race.

Table 3-2 Racial Composition of 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972 Respondents		1986 Respondents	
	N	%[a]	N	%
Caucasian	1,292	97	1,198	92.0
Black	23	2	46	3.5
Hispanic[b]			21	1.6
American Indian	1	—	6	.5
Asian	3	—	6	.5
Other	8	1	7	.5
No response	6	—	18	1.4
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100.0

[a]Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[b]This category was not used in the 1972 study.

Because of the few respondents in any minority category other than "Black," comparisons by race combine all minorities into one group. We acknowledge that different minority groups (e.g., Hispanic or American Indian faculty members) may differ in activities and attitudes about the field. However, the small numbers in these categories precluded meaningful group analyses.

Minority representation among faculty respondents increased over threefold between 1972 and 1986, from 2% to about 7%. Male minorities comprised about 5% and female minorities about 2% of the total faculty respondents. Minority representation was substantially greater among female (15%) than among male (6%) faculty members. But unlike women faculty, minority faculty were not disproportionately represented among those hired within the past five years (see Chapter 6).

The 1986 educational administration professoriate was more male-dominated (89%), when compared with the proportion of male faculty members (73%) across disciplines (Carnegie Foundation, 1984). However, minority representation among educational administration faculty members was similar to the percentage of minorities in the professoriate at large (7%).

Age

The mean age of educational administration faculty members climbed from 48 in 1972 to 52 in 1986. On the average, 1986 educational administration faculty were four years older than faculty across disciplines in higher education (Carnegie Foundation, 1984). As a group, female educational administration faculty members in 1986 were 9 years younger than their male colleagues, and minorities were 4 years younger than Caucasian faculty members (Table 3-3).

Table 3-3 Age Distribution of 1972 Respondents and 1986 Respondents by Gender and Race

Age Category	1972 Total Respondents N	1972 Total Respondents %*	1986 Male Respondents N	1986 Male Respondents %	1986 Female Respondents N	1986 Female Respondents %	1986 Caucasian Respondents N	1986 Caucasian Respondents %	1986 Minority Respondents N	1986 Minority Respondents %	1986 Total Respondents N	1986 Total Respondents %
20-29	15	1	2	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	2	—
30-39	264	20	66	6	39	29	89	8	16	19	105	8
40-49	502	38	294	26	49	36	316	27	24	28	343	26
50-59	341	26	558	48	33	25	554	46	32	37	591	45
60-69	172	13	206	18	4	3	202	17	7	8	211	16
70 and over	6	1	9	1	—	—	9	1	—	—	9	1
No response	33	3	24	2	10	7	26	2	7	8	41	3
Total	1,333	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	1,302*	100
Mean	48		53		44		52		48		52	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Although the average age of educational administration faculty has risen, the 1986 respondents entered the professorship at an earlier mean age (M=37) than did the 1972 cohort (M=39). A [illegible] proportion of faculty members (6%) were over 50 years of age when they [illegible] their first professorial position; over half entered the professoriate between the ages of 30 and 39 (Table 3-4). A 9% decrease was noted between 1972 and [illegible] in the number of faculty entering the professoriate after the age of 40 (from [illegible] to 30%). As a group, faculty who identified with higher education administration were 3 years younger (M=34), when first appointed to a professorial position, than were faculty who considered K-12 administration their level of concentration (M=37), see discriminant analysis table in Appendix H).

Over three fifths of the 1986 respondents indicated that they expected to retire between the ages of 56 and 70, the mean anticipated retirement age was 64 (Table 3-5). Given that the average age of the 1986 incumbents was 52 and the majority planned to retire by age 65, if respondents follow through with their intentions, about half of the current cohort of educational administration faculty will leave the professoriate before the year 2000.

Table 3-4 Age at Which 1972 and 1986 Respondents Entered the Professorship

	1972		1986	
Age Category	N	%*	N	%
20-29	119	9	167	13
30-39	659	50	677	52
40-49	414	31	306	24
50-59	86	7	67	5
60-69	13	1	8	1
No response	42	2	77	6
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean	39		37	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Marital Status

The proportion of unmarried educational administration faculty members in 1986 (13%) was more than twice that of the 1972 cohort (6%). This increase can be attributed primarily to the increase in the number of women faculty, 52% of whom were unmarried in the 1986 group (Table 3-6). The vast majority of male respondents in 1972 and 1986 were married (94% and 91%, respectively). The proportion of single minority faculty members (17%) exceeded the total mean, which is not surprising given the greater female representation among minority respondents.

Table 3-5 Age at Which 1986 Respondents Plan to Retire

Age	N	%
50 or younger	13	1
51-55	64	5
56-60	198	15
61-65	512	39
66-70	229	18
71 or older	36	3
No response	250	19
Total	1,302	100
Mean	64.2	

Table 3-6 Marital Status of 1972 Respondents and 1986 Respondents by Gender and Race

	1972		1986									
	Total Respondents		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	75	6	93	8	70	52	148	12	15	17	163	13
Married	1,251	94	1,055	91	64	47	1,043	87	70	81	1,120	86
No response	7	—	12	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	19	2
Total	1,333	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Parental Occupations

Over two fifths of the respondents in both the 1972 and 1986 cohorts indicated that their fathers' occupations were professional or managerial (Table 3-7). Female respondents in 1986 were more likely than males to indicate that their fathers were in white collar positions (52% compared with 41%). Minority faculty members were less likely than Caucasians to report that their fathers had professional or managerial positions (30% compared with 43%) and were twice as likely to report that their fathers worked as semi-skilled or unskilled laborers (31% compared to 15%).

Data related to the occupations of respondents' mothers were gathered only in the 1986 survey. About half of the 1986 male respondents and three fifths of the female respondents reported that their mothers worked outside the home (Table 3-8). Of those faculty with employed mothers, half of the men and almost two thirds of the women reported that their mothers held professional or managerial roles.

Minority respondents were more than twice as likely to report that their mothers were semi-skilled or unskilled laborers (20% compared to 9%).

Table 3-7 Father's Occupation of 1972 Respondents and 1986 Respondents Grouped by Gender and Race

	1972		1986									
	Total Respondents		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional	218	16	230	20	34	25	247	21	16	19	264	20
Managerial	375	28	240	21	36	27	266	22	9	11	276	21
Skilled laborer	248	19	246	21	25	19	252	21	16	19	271	21
Semi-skilled laborer	153	12	117	10	7	5	114	10	9	11	124	10
Unskilled laborer	95	7	76	7	4	3	62	5	17	20	80	6
Other	231	17	97	8	13	10	101	8	8	9	110	8
Not employed*			43	4	5	4	44	4	3	4	48	4
No response	13	1	111	10	11	8	112	9	8	9	129	10
Total	1,333	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	1,302*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*This category was not used in the 1972 survey.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Professional Characteristics

Institutional Affiliation and Assignment

Fewer than three fifths of the educational administration faculty respondents in 1986 were employed at research (35%) or doctorate-granting institutions (22%). As noted in Chapter 1, the proportion of faculty affiliated with UCEA-member institutions declined between the 1972 and 1986 surveys (43% to 27%). There were 10 fewer UCEA-member institutions in 1986 than in 1972, and the mean number of faculty members at these institutions has declined (see Chapter 2). Also, the number of nonresearch institutions involved in the preparation of school administrators has increased.

The geographic distribution of the universities and faculty respondents is reflected by region and state in Table 3-9. The respondents represented every state and several Canadian provinces. Using the same regional classification employed in 1972, some differences were apparent in the distribution of the two cohorts. The North Central region produced the largest portion of respondents in 1972 (34%, not tabled) compared with 28% of the 1986 respondents from this region. In 1986, the South accounted for the largest share of respondents, 40% compared with 26% from the South in 1972. Less than one fifth of both cohorts were from the Northeast (18% in 1972 and 14% in 1986) or the West (17% in 1972 and 15% in 1986). New York

produced the most respondents of any single state in 1972 (n=131), while Texas provided the largest number (n=124) in the 1986 study.

Table 3-8 Mother's Occupation of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Gender and Race

	Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional	200	17	29	22	215	18	13	15	229	18
Managerial	83	7	23	17	100	8	4	5	106	8
Skilled laborer	73	6	3	2	69	6	6	7	76	6
Semi-skilled laborer	64	6	4	3	60	5	7	8	68	5
Unskilled laborer	56	5	6	4	52	4	10	12	62	5
Other	113	10	16	12	116	10	12	14	129	10
Not employed	475	41	49	36	490	41	31	36	524	40
No response	96	8	5	4	96	8	3	4	108	8
Total	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	1,302*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Slightly over half of the 1986 respondents indicated that they were assigned full-time to educational administration. Thirty-eight percent reported that they held an administrative position in addition to their professorial role; only 19% indicated that they spent over a quarter of their time in an administrative assignment. In contrast, 29% of the 1972 respondents indicated that they devoted more than a quarter of their time to an administrative role (Table 3-10).

Like their counterparts in 1972, almost three fourths of the 1986 respondents indicated that K-12 administration was their level of concentration. The major change between the two cohorts was an increase in the proportion of respondents indicating that higher education was their area of emphasis (14% in 1986 compared with 8% in 1972). Even though recently hired female faculty members were more likely to identify with K-12 administration (see Chapter 6), one fifth of all female respondents indicated that higher education administration was their primary area of expertise (Table 3-11). Respondents from research institutions and UCEA-member institutions were more likely than their colleagues at other institutions to designate higher education as their area of emphasis. Fewer than two thirds of the respondents from research institutions and UCEA members indicated that K-12 administration was their area of concentration.

Table 3-9 Distribution of Universities and Faculty Respondents by Region and State

	No. of Universities	No. of Respondents	% of Total Respondents
Northeast	60	180	13.8
Connecticut	2	10	.8
Massachusetts	5	12	.9
Maine	2	6	.5
New Hampshire	2	2	.2
New Jersey	6	18	1.4
New York	27	87	6.7
Pennsylvania	14	37	2.8
Rhode Island	1	3	.2
Vermont	1	5	.4
North Central	83	368	28.2
Illinois	16	78	6.0
Indiana	7	31	2.4
Iowa	6	23	1.7
Kansas	4	16	1.8
Michigan	6	33	2.5
Minnesota	7	27	2.1
Missouri	9	32	2.5
Nebraska	6	27	2.1
North Dakota	1	6	.5
Ohio	15	65	5.0
South Dakota	2	6	.4
Wisconsin	4	24	1.8
South	137	524	40.0
Alabama	13	37	2.8
Arkansas	2	11	.8
Delaware	1	2	.2
District of Columbia	2	6	.5
Florida	12	43	3.3
Georgia	7	33	2.5
Kentucky	9	28	2.2
Louisiana	12	34	2.6
Maryland	4	12	.9
Mississippi	4	18	1.4
North Carolina	8	29	2.2
Oklahoma	9	39	3.0
South Carolina	5	19	1.5
Tennessee	9	44	3.4
Texas	28	124	9.5
Virginia	9	35	2.7
West Virginia	3	10	.8
West	55	198	15.2
Alaska	3	4	.3
Arizona	3	26	2.0
California	18	58	4.5
Colorado	4	11	.8
Hawaii	1	6	.5
Idaho	1	5	.4
New Mexico	5	14	1.1
Montana	2	9	.7
Nevada	1	2	.2
Oregon	3	12	.9
Utah	3	20	1.5
Washington	10	30	2.3
Wyoming	1	1	.1
Canada	6	37	2.8
	341[a]	1,307[b]	100.0

[a]No faculty members responded from 31 of the 372 institutions included in the study.
[b]5 questionnaires were received too late to be included in the analysis.

Table 3-10 Portion of Time Devoted to University Administration by 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
Percentage of time	N	%*	N	%
None or no response	760	57	812	62
1-25	187	14	241	19
26-50	200	15	144	11
51-75	106	8	69	5
76-100	80	6	36	3
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean	17.6		14.8	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Tenure Status and Academic Rank

Although the department chairpersons indicated that only one fifth of the faculty were not tenured (see Chapter 2), 27% of the individual faculty respondents either did not respond to this item or indicated they were not tenured. Using either data source, the proportion of tenured faculty has increased since 1972 when 65% of the respondents held tenure. One third of the faculty in 1972 compared to 60% in 1986 had been tenured for six or more years. The mean number of years since tenure was granted for 1986 respondents was almost 12 (Table 3-12).

Consistent with the data provided by department chairpersons, about three fifths of the 1986 faculty respondents held the rank of professor (Table 3-13), compared with half of the 1972 cohort (not tabled). However, as discussed in Chapter 2, tenure status and academic rank differed substantially by gender and race within the 1986 cohort.

The 1986 educational administration professoriate was more tenured and top heavy with faculty holding the rank of professor when compared with faculty members across disciplines. In 1984, the proportion of tenured faculty across fields was 69%, and faculty were more evenly divided across academic ranks; 34% were professors, 25% were associate professors, and 21% were assistant professors (Carnegie Foundation, 1984).

Content Specialization

The 1986 respondents were asked to identify their content specialization within administration. The most popular specializations were organizational theory (13%)

Table 3-11 Level of Concentration of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
K-12 education administration	283	63	218	75	437	78	845	73	90	67	870	73	60	69	225	63	713	76	938	72
Community college administration	11	2	5	2	4	1	19	2	1	1	19	2	1	1	9	3	11	1	20	2
Higher education administration	95	21	39	13	50	9	156	13	27	20	168	14	13	15	74	21	110	12	184	14
Other	20	4	18	6	23	4	48	4	10	7	54	5	3	4	17	5	44	5	61	5
No response	41	8	12	4	46	8	92	8	7	5	87	7	9	11	34	9	65	7	99	8
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

and the principalship (12%) (Table 3-14). Female respondents were almost twice as likely as males to consider organizational theory their primary specialization (23% compared to 12% for males); relatively few women designated economics or finance as content specialties (1% compared to 7% for males). The responses of minority faculty paralleled those of women in that 21% considered organizational theory and 2% considered economics and finance to be their content specializations.

Table 3-12 Number of Years since Tenure Was Granted Reported by 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
Number of years	N	%*	N	%
0 or no response	471	35	346	27
1 - 5 years	419	32	189	15
6 - 10 years	193	15	236	18
11 - 15 years	124	9	270	21
16 - 20 years	68	5	188	15
Over 20 years	58	4	73	6
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean		8.0		11.8

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Compensation

According to the American Association of University Professors (1987), the mean faculty salary across all ranks and disciplines in 1986-87 was $35,470, with education faculty as a group making about $5,000 below the mean. Compensation for educational administration faculty compared favorably with the average across disciplines, as the mean academic year salary of the 1986 educational administration cohort was between $35,000 and $40,000; 55% reported salaries between $30,000 and $45,000 (Table 3-15). Minorities, on the average, made $5,000 less than Caucasians, and women made $10,000 less than men. Only 31% of the women made over $35,000, while 74% of the men were compensated above this level. This gender difference was not surprising because almost two fifths of the women had been hired within the preceding five years and were disproportionately concentrated in lower academic ranks.

Table 3-13 Tenure Status and Academic Rank of Educational Administration Faculty Members in 1986

	Data from 1,302 Faculty Respondents		Data from 297 Department Chairs	
	N	%*	N	%
Rank*				
Assistant professors	135	10.4	197	12.2
Associate professors	353	27.1	451	27.9
Professors	773	59.4	971	60.0
Tenure status				
Tenured faculty	956	73.4	1,303	80.5
Nontenured faculty	346	26.6[b]	316	19.5
Total	1,302	100.0	1,619	100.0

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a]3.2% of the faculty respondents (n=41) indicated that they did not hold a professorial rank or did not specify their rank.
[b]This includes 342 respondents (26%) who did not answer the item requesting the number of years since tenure was granted.

However, controlling for rank, there were still gender differences in compensation (Table 3-16). For example, male associate professors were more than twice as likely as their female counterparts to make $35,000 or more for the academic year (55% compared to 26%), and male assistant professors were over three times as likely to receive this salary (25% compared to 8% for women). Salary differences within the new faculty cohort are addressed in Chapter 6.

Faculty at UCEA-member institutions reported an average of $5,000 more in academic year salary than did their non-UCEA counterparts. Similarly, the mean salaries for respondents employed at research and doctorate-granting institutions were about $5,000 higher than the mean salaries for counterparts at comprehensive institutions (see also discriminant analysis tables in Appendix H).

Approximately three fourths of the respondents augmented their academic year salary by teaching summer school. Of those who taught, the average summer school income was between $4,000 and $6,000 (Table 3-17). Respondents employed at research institutions were less likely to report summer school income than were their colleagues at other types of institutions. Perhaps faculty at research institutions do not have to teach during the summer because their academic year salaries are higher and they are more likely to have income from external sources (e.g., consulting, federal or foundation grants, Table 3-18). Only 13% of the faculty at research institutions reported that they received no external income during the academic year, while over one fifth of the faculty at comprehensive institutions indicated that they received no external income. The average external income was reported to be between $2,000 and $4,000, with over half of all respondents (52%) indicating that they received less than $2,000 from external sources during the academic year.

Table 3-14 Area of Primary Specialization of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Program administration	37	8	40	14	61	11	123	11	15	11	122	11	15	17	35	10	103	11	138	11
Curriculum	18	4	18	6	43	8	62	5	15	11	70	6	6	7	14	4	65	7	79	6
Economics and finance	38	8	19	7	25	5	81	7	1	1	80	7	2	2	33	9	49	5	82	6
Institutional research	3	1	2	1	5	1	8	1	2	2	9	1	1	1	1	—	9	1	10	1
Law	37	8	20	7	50	9	95	8	12	9	101	8	5	6	26	7	81	9	107	8
Personnel management	20	4	10	3	24	4	50	4	4	3	53	4	1	1	14	4	40	4	54	4
Organizational theory	69	15	45	15	61	11	143	12	31	23	155	13	18	21	57	16	118	13	175	13
Collective bargaining	5	1	4	1	1	—	9	1	1	1	10	1	—	—	5	1	5	1	10	1
Policy studies	24	5	9	3	11	2	38	3	6	4	42	4	2	2	23	6	21	2	44	3
Research methodology	17	4	17	6	23	4	47	4	9	7	54	5	2	2	16	5	41	4	57	5
Social, historical, or philosophical issues	25	6	6	2	8	1	35	3	4	3	37	3	2	2	13	4	26	3	39	3
Student personnel	15	3	4	1	2	—	18	2	2	2	18	2	1	1	7	2	14	2	21	2
Principalship	37	8	37	13	86	15	148	13	12	9	149	12	11	13	36	10	124	13	160	12
Community education	9	2	3	1	4	1	15	1	—	—	14	1	1	1	7	2	9	1	16	1
School-community relations	9	2	5	2	9	2	22	2	1	1	22	2	1	1	8	2	15	2	23	2
Other	53	12	14	5	46	8	103	9	10	7	106	9	5	6	38	11	75	8	113	9
No response	34	8	39	13	101	18	163	14	10	7	155	13	13	15	26	7	148	16	174	13
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 3-13 Academic Year Salary of 1986 Respondents by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than $20,000	2	—	3	1	14	3	18	2	1	1	19	2	—	—	2	1	17	2	19	2
$20,000-$24,999	13	3	10	3	21	4	26	2	18	14	38	3	6	7	10	3	34	4	44	3
$25,000-$29,999	37	8	20	7	64	11	78	7	43	32	109	9	11	13	28	8	93	10	121	9
$30,000-$34,999	48	11	46	16	108	19	172	15	30	22	183	15	19	22	36	10	166	18	202	16
$35,000-$39,999	95	21	59	20	124	22	261	23	17	13	255	21	21	24	73	20	205	22	278	21
$40,000-$44,999	72	16	58	20	103	18	223	19	9	7	220	18	10	12	54	15	179	19	233	18
$45,000-$49,999	58	13	32	11	54	10	135	12	7	5	130	11	11	13	42	12	102	11	144	11
$50,000-$54,999	54	12	27	9	32	6	107	9	4	3	104	9	6	7	45	13	68	7	113	9
$55,000 or more	62	14	34	12	32	6	123	11	4	3	122	10	2	2	61	17	67	7	128	10
No response	9	2	3	1	8	1	17	2	2	2	18	2	—	—	8	2	12	1	20	2
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 3-16 Academic Year Salary of 1986 Respondents By Rank and Gender

Salary level	Professors						Associate Professors						Assistant Professors					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
$30,000 or more	713	98	27	85	740	96	251	82	30	65	281	80	45	52	9	19	54	40
$35,000 or more	652	90	22	70	674	87	167	55	12	26	179	51	21	25	4	8	25	19
$40,000 or more	495	69	16	52	511	66	76	25	5	11	81	23	10	12	1	2	11	8

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Educational Background

The proportion of respondents with undergraduate majors in education increased significantly between 1972 and 1986 (from 26% to 41%, Table 3-19). The proportion indicating undergraduate majors in humanities declined substantially (from 28% to 9%), consistent with the trend in baccalaureate majors across disciplines (Frances, 1985). Fifty-one percent of the 1972 respondents, compared with only 38% of the 1986 group, held master's degrees in educational administration, (Table 3-20). At the doctoral level, over two thirds of both cohorts majored in educational administration (72% in 1972 and 68% in 1986, Table 3-21). Since 12% did not respond to this question in 1986, it is likely that the proportion with doctorates in educational administration was even higher than in 1972.

The majority of the 1986 faculty members indicated that their highest degree was the doctorate (Table 3-22); 50% held the EdD, while 44% held the PhD. Female respondents were more likely than males to hold the PhD (55% compared to 42%). Minority respondents, however, were equally divided between holding the PhD (44%) and the EdD (45%). As would be expected, over half of the faculty at research institutions (52%) and at UCEA-member institutions (54%) held the PhD.

Campbell and Newell (1973) reported that half of the 1972 cohort received their doctorates from the twenty "prestige" institutions identified by Sims (1970) and Higgins (1968). The institutions from which the 1986 respondents received their doctorates were somewhat more diffuse, however. Faculty who responded to this item in 1986 (n=1,214) received doctorates from about 185 different institutions. Only four institutions, Michigan State University, The Ohio State University, Columbia University, and Indiana University accounted for over 3% of the faculty members (Table 3-23). Thirty-four institutions produced at least 1% of the 1986 faculty, and these institutions accounted for 59% of the respondents. The top 20 producers of educational administration faculty in 1986 accounted for almost 44% of the respondents. The conclusion of Campbell and Newell in 1972 that only a handful of institutions produced the majority of educational administration professors applied primarily to faculty employed at research institutions in 1986; 53% of the faculty at research universities received their doctorates from 20 institutions (Table 3-24). In contrast, the 20 highest producers of faculty at comprehensive universities accounted for only 43% of the faculty members at those institutions. This topic is revisited in Chapter 7, with particular attention to the institutions from which faculty at highly rated programs received their doctorates.

Table 3-17 Summer School Income of 1986 Respondents by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%N	%	N	%	
None	132	29	58	20	125	22	273	24	39	29	288	24	24	28	103	29	212	23	315	24
Less than $2,000	25	6	17	6	50	9	72	6	20	15	85	7	5	6	17	5	75	8	92	7
$2,000-$3,999	49	11	41	14	74	13	143	12	21	16	147	12	15	17	35	10	129	14	164	13
$4,000-$5,999	71	16	47	16	102	18	197	17	23	17	204	17	15	17	55	15	165	18	220	17
$6,000-$7,999	57	13	31	11	79	14	151	13	15	11	157	13	8	9	53	15	114	12	167	13
$8,000-$9,999	42	9	36	12	50	9	121	10	7	5	114	10	12	14	36	10	92	10	128	10
$10,000-$11,999	28	6	25	9	32	6	79	7	4	3	80	7	3	4	23	6	62	7	85	7
$12,000-$13,999	12	3	11	4	24	4	45	4	2	2	45	4	1	1	13	4	34	4	47	4
$14,000 or more	18	4	20	7	11	2	46	4	3	2	46	4	2	2	15	4	34	4	49	4
No response	16	3	6	2	13	2	33	3	1	1	32	3	1	1	9	3	26	3	35	3
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302[a]	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a]The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 3-18 External Income[a] of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%[b]	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	60	13	46	16	119	21	195	17	28	21	204	17	19	22	51	14	174	19	225	17
Less than $2,000	133	30	92	32	224	40	395	34	52	39	410	34	32	37	98	27	351	37	449	35
$2,000-$3,999	65	14	53	18	77	14	174	15	19	14	180	15	10	12	54	15	141	15	195	15
$4,000-$5,999	57	13	25	9	44	8	113	10	13	10	115	10	11	13	53	15	73	8	126	10
$6,000-$7,999	31	7	20	7	20	4	63	5	7	5	69	6	1	1	21	6	50	5	71	6
$8,000-$9,999	19	4	10	3	10	2	35	3	4	3	35	3	4	5	10	3	29	3	39	3
$10,000-$11,999	14	3	13	5	13	2	35	3	5	4	35	3	5	6	13	4	27	3	40	3
$12,000-$13,999	9	2	8	3	7	1	23	2	1	1	22	2	2	2	9	3	15	2	24	2
$14,000 or more	51	11	20	7	33	6	99	9	5	4	101	8	1	1	42	12	62	7	104	8
No response	11	2	5	2	13	2	28	2	1	1	27	2	1	1	8	2	17	2	25	2
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302[c]	100

[b] Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a] Income received during the academic year from consulting activities, grants, etc.
[c] The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 3-19 Undergraduate Majors of 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
Major	N	%*	N	%
Science and mathematics	158	12	113	9
Education	349	26	531	41
Humanities	379	28	119	9
Social sciences	261	20	203	16
Public and business administration	45	3	35	3
Other	119	9	42	3
No response	22	2	259	20
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 3-20 Master's Degree Majors of 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
Major	N	%*	N	%
Educational administration	673	51	493	38
Other education	296	22	390	30
Humanities	96	7	35	3
Science and mathematics	15	1	18	2
Social sciences	109	8	73	6
Public and business administration	73	6	6	1
Other	25	2	6	1
No response	46	3	281	22
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Employment History

Of the 942 individuals who reported their employment history, the average length of time they had spent in their current roles was about 11 years (not tabled).

Almost three fifths indicated that they had been involved either in university teaching (39%) or university administration (19%) immediately preceding their current roles. The average length of time spent in the previous position was approximately 5.5 years. Less than one fourth of the respondents reported that they had been superintendents (12%) or other K-12 school administrators (11%) in their most recent positions, and 29% had been superintendents (12%) or other administrators (17%) in their second most recent positions (Table 3-25).

Table 3-21 Doctoral Degree Majors of 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
Major	N	%*	N	%
Educational administration	961	72	886	68
Other education	196	15	199	15
Humanities	9	1	7	1
Science and mathematics	2	—	5	—
Social sciences	42	3	33	3
Public and business administration	66	5	8	1
Other	12	1	5	—
No response	45	3	159	12
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding

Summary

Compared with faculty across disciplines (Carnegie Foundation, 1984), the educational administration professoriate is more male-dominated, more tenured, and more top heavy with those holding the rank of professor. The typical educational administration professor in 1986 became a faculty member at age 37, was 52 in 1986, and anticipated retirement by age 64. A white, married male, he more likely held an EdD than a PhD, probably earned his doctorate in educational administration before 1975, likely held a faculty role prior to his current position, had been tenured for more than a decade, and had attained the rank of professor. The most likely area of concentration was K-12 administration, and the most popular content specializations were organizational theory and the principalship.

With a few exceptions, the above description of personal and professional characteristics could also have been used to describe the typical educational administration faculty member in 1972. Nonetheless, some differences are

Table 3-22 Highest Degree of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
PhD	232	52	144	49	190	34	492	42	74	55	523	44	38	44	195	54	371	39	566	44
EdD	194	43	131	45	320	57	596	51	47	35	601	52	39	45	149	42	496	53	645	50
JD	6	1	6	2	12	2	21	2	3	2	22	2	1	1	3	1	21	2	24	2
Other or no response	18	4	11	4	38	7	51	4	11	8	52	5	8	9	12	3	35	6	67	5
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	958	100	1,302*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 3-23 Doctorate-Granting Institutions of 1986 Respondents

Rank	Institution[a]	No. of Faculty	% of Faculty[b]
1	Michigan State U.	47	3.9
2	Ohio State U.	41	3.4
3	Columbia U.	37	3.1
	Indiana U.	37	3.1
5	U. of Nebraska	34	2.8
6	U. of Iowa	33	2.7
	Stanford U.	33	2.7
	U. of Wisconsin-Madison	33	2.7
9	U. of Chicago	31	2.6
10	U. of Florida	25	1.9
11	Pennsylvania State U.	22	1.8
12	U. of Texas-Austin	21	1.7
13	Florida State U.	20	1.7
14	U. of Missouri	19	1.6
15	U. of Michigan	18	1.5
	U. of Tennessee	18	1.5
17	U. of Illinois	17	1.4
18	U. of Alabama	16	1.3
	U. of N. Colorado	16	1.3
20	U. of Alberta	15	1.2
	U. of Georgia	15	1.2
	Harvard U.	15	1.2
	U. of Minnesota	15	1.2
24	U. of California-Berkeley	14	1.1
	U. of Oklahoma	14	1.1
	U. of Oregon	14	1.1
	Syracuse U.	14	1.1
	Vanderbilt U.	14	1.1
29	U. of Wyoming	13	1.1
	U. of Colorado	13	1.1
31	East Texas State U.	12	1.0
	Oklahoma State U.	12	1.0
	U. of Mississippi	12	1.0
	U. of Virginia	12	1.0

[a]Only institutions producing at least 1% of the total faculty who responded to this item are included.
[b]Reflects percentage of 1,214 respondents to this item.

noteworthy. Only 35% of the 1986 respondents were employed at research institutions. Without question, a substantial proportion of graduate degrees in educational administration are currently being conferred by nonresearch institutions, and many of these programs are staffed by faculty who did not receive their doctorates at research institutions.

Some marked demographic changes have also taken place since 1972. More educational administration faculty members are women, and a large proportion are older. The increasing female representation and an aging professoriate have significant implications for the future of administrative preparation programs, implications which are discussed in some detail in Chapter 8.

Table 3-24 Doctorate-Granting Institutions of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Institutional Classification[a]

Respondents at Research Institutions (N=423)				Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=278)				Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=513)			
Rank	Institution	No. of Faculty	% of Research Faculty	No. of Rank	Institution	% of Doctorate Faculty	No. of Faculty	Rank	Institution	Faculty	% of Comprehensive Faculty
1	Michigan State U.	19	4.5	1	Ohio State U.	14	5.1	1	Columbia U.	17	3.3
	U. of Wisconsin-Madison	19	4.5	2	Michigan State U.	13	4.7	2	U. of Nebraska	16	3.1
3	U. of Iowa	17	4.0	3	Stanford U.	9	3.2		Ohio State U.	16	3.1
4	U. of Chicago	16	3.8	4	Columbia U.	8	2.9	4	Indiana U.	15	2.9
5	Indiana U.	15	3.6		U. of Chicago	8	2.9		Michigan State U.	15	2.9
	Stanford U.	15	3.6		U. of Florida	8	2.9	6	SUNY-Buffalo	12	2.3
7	U. of Nebraska	14	3.3	7	Indiana U.	7	2.7	7	U. of Alabama	11	2.2
8	Columbia U.	12	2.8		U. of Iowa		7	2.5	U. of Oklahoma	11	2.2
9	Ohio State U.	11	2.6		U. of Michigan	7	2.5	9	Florida State U.	10	1.9
	Pennsylvania State U.	11	2.6		U. of Tennessee	7	2.5		U. of Missippi	10	1.9
11	U. of Florida	10	2.4		U. of Wisconsin-Madison	7	2.5		U. of Missouri	10	1.9
12	U. of Cal.-Berkeley	8	1.9	12	U. of Colorado	6	2.2		U. of Texas-Austin	10	1.9
	U. of Illinois	8	1.9		U. of New Mexico	6	2.2	13	U. of Iowa	9	1.8
	U. of Minnesota	8	1.9	14	U. of Alabama	5	1.8		Pennsylvania State U.	9	1.8
	Syracuse U.	8	1.9		Florida State U.	5	1.8		Stanford U.	9	1.8
16	U. of N. Colorado	7	1.7		Harvard U.	5	1.8	16	UCLA	8	1.6
	Oklahoma State U.	7	1.7		U. of Illinois	5	1.8		U. of Georgia	8	1.6
	U. of Texas-Austin	7	1.7		U. of Missouri	5	1.8		U. of Wyoming	8	1.6
19	U. of Alberta	6	1.4		U. of N. Colorado	5	1.8	19	U. of Chicago	7	1.4
	Claremont Grad. Sch.	6	1.4	20	U. of Nebraska	4	1.4		Duke U.	7	1.4
	U. of Georgia	6	1.4		U. of Texas-Austin	4	1.4		U. of Florida	7	1.4
	Harvard U.	6	1.4		Washington State U.	4	1.4		U. of Kentucky	7	1.4
	U. of Michigan	6	1.4						U. of N. Carolina	7	1.4
	Purdue U.	6	1.4						U. of Oregon	7	1.4
	Vanderbilt U.	6	1.4						U. of Tennessee	7	1.4
									Vanderbilt U.	7	1.4
									U. of Wisconsin-Madison	7	1.4

[a]Only institutions producing at least 1% of the total faculty who responded to this item are included. The original intent was to reflect the 20 top producers for each category. However, because of ties at specific ranks, the number reflected varies from 22 to 27 institutions.

Table 3-25 First and Second Most Recent Positions Held by 1986 Respondents

	1st Most Recent Position		2nd Most Recent Position	
	N	%*	N	%
Higher education teaching	377	39	241	28
Higher education administration	184	19	127	15
Superintendent	118	12	107	12
Other K-12 administration	111	11	147	17
K-12 teaching	25	3	94	11
Military service	14	1	31	4
Civil service	6	1	6	1
Consultant	9	1	8	1
Other	98	10	100	12
Total respondents to item	942	100	861	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 4 ❖❖❖

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY

Within reasonable limits, faculty have the latitude to establish their work schedules and to allocate their time among a variety of activities. Opportunities to interact with persons of widely differing ideas, interests, and ages coupled with personal and professional autonomy make an academic career quite attractive for creative, self-directed individuals. Yet the flexibility associated with a faculty member's role can also be a source of stress. Academics become frustrated because of competing demands on their time and the feeling that their work is never finished. "Faculty members are asked to do many different professional tasks—more than enough to fill one's entire life—and success is always measured against time" (Sorcinelli & Gregory, 1987, p. 45). There is always another research question to be analyzed, article to write, or service activity waiting to be pursued. Faculty members feel pulled in many directions and, as Bowen and Schuster (1986) noted: "All competent faculty members live with the sense that they are dealing with infinity, that they can never fully catch up" (p. 69).

In contrast to workers in nonagricultural occupations who spend an average of 36 hours per week on job-related activities (Bowen & Schuster, 1986), studies of workload in academe suggest that faculty devote between 45 and 62 hours per week to professional activities (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; National Education Association, 1979; National Science Foundation, 1981; Yuker, 1984). The amount of time devoted to various professional activities is related to the type of institution where a faculty member is employed and to the individual's academic discipline, age, and stage of life and career (Austin & Gamson, 1983; Blackburn, Behymer & Hall, 1978; Ladd, 1979; Pelz & Andrews, 1976).

This chapter describes how professors of educational administration allocate their time among teaching, research, and service activities. As in the preceding chapter, the information is analyzed with respondents grouped by gender, race, UCEA affiliation, and type of institution where employed according to the Carnegie (1987) classification of institutions of higher education. We note areas where faculty activities differed by their level of concentration (K-12 or higher education) and highlight similarities and differences between the 1972 and 1986 cohorts.

Primary Role Orientation

Respondents identified their primary area of strength using the traditional professorial functions of teaching, research, and service. Similar to the 1972 study, a majority of the 1986 respondents (68%) indicated that teaching was their primary strength, with 78% of the minority faculty making this choice (Table 4-1). Eighty percent of the faculty at comprehensive institutions noted that teaching was their primary strength, while only slightly over half (53%) of the respondents from research institutions made this choice. Almost one fourth (24%) of the respondents at research institutions identified research as their greatest strength, compared with less than one tenth (8%) of the respondents at comprehensive institutions. Similarly, respondents at UCEA institutions were twice as likely as their non-UCEA colleagues to indicate that research was their primary strength (23% compared to 11%).

There were differences in designated area of strength when respondents were grouped by gender and length of time in the professoriate. Women were more likely than men to consider research their greatest strength (20% compared to 14%). Conversely, men were more likely than women to designate service as their area of primary strength (15% compared to 8%). Compared with their experienced colleagues, more new faculty (those who had been in the professoriate five or fewer years) indicated that research was their greatest strength (24% compared to 13%). Activities and attitudes of new faculty are addressed in Chapter 6.

Table 4-2 presents the results of the discriminant analysis of faculty who reported teaching, research, or service to be their primary strength. Two functions were required to account for the differences. In the first function, negative coefficients represented faculty whose primary orientation was research. The best predictor of research as a primary strength was the amount of time faculty spent on research and writing activities—about 27% compared with less than 10% for faculty who viewed teaching and service as their primary roles. In addition, faculty who considered research their primary strength also were far less likely to agree that former practitioners make the best professors and were less likely to be satisfied with the quality of graduate students. They were also uncertain about whether field studies strengthen practice or whether the best faculty are leaving the academy. These perceptions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

The second function discriminated between those who viewed teaching as their primary strength (positive coefficients) and those whose strength was service (negative coefficients). The best predictor of a service-oriented faculty member

was the amount of time spent consulting. These faculty were less likely to consider the low salary levels in the department to be a serious problem and were more satisfied with the caliber of graduate students. Faculty who viewed teaching as their primary strength spent much more time with graduate and undergraduate students and spent somewhat more time on research and writing than did their service-oriented counterparts.

These findings should be interpreted with caution as only slightly more than 60% of the cases were correctly classified. Nevertheless, some classic differences based on faculty role orientations were empirically confirmed. For example, those faculty who spent considerable time consulting were firm believers in the proposition that spending time in the field is important and were also more satisfied with the quality of graduate students. Faculty who described themselves as researchers viewed time in the field as less important to their work and were not as satisfied with the caliber of students. A cleavage apparently exists in many preparation programs between teacher-scholars and those whose primary commitment is to working with practicing administrators. Various aspects of these professorial functions are explored in the remainder of this chapter.

Research Activities

Research has become more important for promotion and tenure decisions as well as for illuminating administrative practice in educational settings. When compared with earlier cohorts of educational administration faculty, the 1986 group was more involved in research. Three quarters of the respondents reported some inquiry activity compared with less than half of the faculty in a 1964 survey (Hills, 1965). The proportion of faculty members devoting at least 10% of their time to research increased from under one third of the respondents in 1964 (Hills, 1965), to about half in 1972 (Campbell & Newell, 1973), to over half of the respondents in 1986. Table 4-3 depicts the percentage of time devoted to research for 1972 and 1986 respondents by UCEA affiliation.

Despite the increase in scholarly activity, educational administration faculty members still devoted a relatively small portion of their time to research when compared with faculty across disciplines. The Carnegie Foundation (1984) reported that faculty in general devoted an average of 18% of their time to research, whereas the mean for the 1986 educational administration respondents was 12%.

Faculty at research institutions and UCEA-member institutions spent more time on research than their counterparts elsewhere, a finding that is consistent with expectations for faculty behavior and reward systems at these institutions. Over one third (37%) of the faculty at comprehensive universities and 29% at non-UCEA institutions indicated that they were not involved in research (compared with 12% at research and 14% at UCEA-member institutions). Women devoted considerably more time to research than did men; the amount of time spent in research by minority faculty did not differ from the overall mean (Table 4-4).

Table 4-1 Area of Primary Strength of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching	240	53	196	67	445	80	786	68	91	67	804	67	67	78	195	54	686	73	881	68
Research	109	24	30	10	45	8	157	14	27	20	175	15	9	11	81	23	103	11	184	14
Service	76	17	48	16	59	11	171	15	11	8	173	14	7	8	64	18	119	13	183	14
No response	25	6	18	6	11	2	46	4	6	4	46	4	3	4	19	5	35	4	54	4
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 4-2 Discriminant Analysis on Faculty Primary Role Orientation

Discriminating Variables	Teaching (N=423) *M*	SD	Research (N=403) *M*	SD	Service (N=94) *M*	SD	Function 1 Undstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Function 1 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Function 2 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Function 2 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities												
Time spent teaching undergraduate students	6.20	14.40	2.43	7.03	4.40	13.19	.14	E-01	.18	.22	E-01	.30
Time spent teaching graduate students	44.42	22.38	30.76	15.90	35.05	20.13	.84	E-02	.18	.28	E-01	.59
Time spent consulting	7.22	7.58	6.47	7.15	12.22	12.18	.14	E-01	.12	-.62	E-01	-.52
Time spent on committee work	6.68	7.72	6.77	6.93	7.00	8.02	.14	E-01	.11	.34	E-02	.03
Time spent on "other" activities	1.94	7.56	2.04	8.36	1.54	6.60	-.12	E-01	-.09	.11	E-01	.08
Time spent on research and writing	9.87	8.99	26.82	17.23	8.91	9.19	-.60	E-01	-.65	.27	E-01	.23
Attitudes												
Poor intellectual climate in department	3.09	0.95	2.49	1.03	3.09	0.91	.17		.16	.50	E-01	.05
Likely to leave academe	4.07	1.25	3.75	1.24	3.90	1.23	.11		.14	.76	E-01	.09
Low salary levels in department	2.69	1.01	2.54	0.93	2.82	0.96	.14		.14	-.29		-.29
Faculty should participate in professional meetings	2.00	0.79	1.75	0.76	2.03	0.81	.16		.13	-.63	E-01	-.05
Lack of able students is a problem	2.94	0.89	2.57	0.91	2.91	1.00	.12		.11	-.70	E-01	-.06
Satisfied with emphasis on research	2.90	1.04	2.71	1.27	2.84	0.97	.41		.04	.17		.18
Satisfied with graduate student quality	2.40	0.91	2.91	0.90	2.64	0.95	-.64	E-01	-.06	-.39		-.35
Field studies strengthen practice	2.34	0.88	2.52	1.05	2.07	0.80	-.07	E-01	-.07	.28		.26
Best faculty are leaving academe	3.24	0.90	3.21	0.91	3.19	0.88	-.16		-.14	.79	E-01	.07
Former practitioners make the best professors	2.78	1.26	4.01	1.05	2.65	1.19	-.21		-.26	.17		.21
Other												
Present age	52.76	7.86	45.60	7.70	50.82	7.54	.33	E-01	.25	.29	E-01	.22
Group Centroids												
Teaching							.33			.18		
Research							-1.67			-.01		
Service							.35			-.79		
Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership											
Teaching	61.20		12.10		26.70							
Research	16.30		67.90		15.80							
Service	29.50		13.70		56.80							
Ungrouped Cases	40.70		27.80		31.50							
	61.54% of cases correctly classified											
Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue		Correlation		Wilks lambda		x^2		D.F.	Significance		
Function 1	.5615		.600		.574		338.01		36	.001		
Function 2	.1161		.322		.896		66.84		17	.001		

Table 4-3 Portion of Time 1972 and 1986 Respondents Spent in Research and Scholarly Writing by UCEA Affiliation

	1972						1986					
	Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		All Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		All Respondents	
Percentage of Time	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	98	17	288	38	386	29	49	14	271	29	320	25
1-9	121	21	182	24	303	23	59	16	227	24	286	22
10-19	167	29	188	25	355	27	97	27	253	27	350	27
20-29	110	19	75	10	185	14	97	27	124	13	221	17
30-39	40	7	8	1	48	4	22	6	38	4	60	5
40-49	17	3	8	1	25	2	18	5	11	1	29	2
50 or more	23	4	8	1	31	2	17	5	19	2	36	3
Total	576	100	757	100	1,333	100	359	100	943	100	1,302	100
Mean							17.0		10.5		12.3	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 4-4 Portion of Time Spent in Research and Scholarly Writing by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, and Race

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents	
Percentage of Time	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	55	12	59	20	206	37	285	25	35	26	296	25	18	21
1-9	78	16	72	25	136	24	270	23	15	11	260	21	24	28
10-19	136	30	88	30	126	23	319	28	27	20	322	27	22	26
20-29	106	24	49	17	66	12	189	16	30	22	203	17	14	16
30-39	30	7	14	5	16	3	48	4	12	9	57	5	3	4
40-49	20	4	6	2	3	1	23	2	6	4	27	2	2	2
50 or more	25	5	4	1	7	1	26	2	10	7	33	3	3	4
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100
Mean	17.2		11.8		8.6		11.7		17.4		12.4		12.6	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

The 1986 cohort published more than did their 1972 counterparts. Sixty-nine percent of the 1986 respondents, compared with only 55% of the 1972 group, had written or edited one or more books in their careers (Table 4-5). A majority of the 1986 cohort had produced two or more volumes. Also, the proportion that had written or edited nine or more books or monographs more than doubled between

1972 and 1986 (5% compared with 12%). Faculty at research institutions had produced an average of one more book than their colleagues at doctorate-granting institutions and an average of almost three more books than counterparts at comprehensive universities (Table 4-6). These data must be interpreted with caution, however, as some 1986 respondents probably included technical reports in their definition of monographs.

Table 4-5 Number of Books Written or Edited in Career Reported by 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972		1986	
	N	%*	N	%
None or no response	593	45	420	32
1	247	18	148	11
2	147	11	196	15
3	108	8	137	11
4	64	5	72	6
5	42	3	86	7
6	36	3	40	3
7	12	1	25	2
8	15	1	19	2
9 or more	69	5	159	12
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean			5.1	
Median			2.4	
Mode			0	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Compared with their 1972 counterparts, twice as many 1986 respondents had published over 20 professional articles, scholarly papers, or book chapters in the preceding 5 years (8% compared with 4%) (Table 4-7). Only 15% of the 1986 cohort had not published any articles or papers in the past 5 years.

Faculty at UCEA-member institutions produced an average of three more articles than did their non-UCEA peers during the preceding 5 years. Respondents at research institutions wrote an average of two more articles than their counterparts from doctorate-granting institutions and an average of four more articles than faculty at comprehensive universities (Table 4-8). The modal number of articles written in the preceding 5 years by respondents at research and doctorate-granting institutions was 10 compared to 3 for counterparts at comprehensive universities. A similar pattern distinguished respondents based on UCEA affiliation.

The mean number of articles written during the preceding 5 years was slightly higher for women (M=10) than for men (M=9). However, the modal number of articles written during this period for males was 10, compared to 2 for females.

Table 4-6 Number of Books Written or Edited in Career Reported by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution

	Respondents at Research Institutions N	% *	Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions N	%	Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions N	%
None or no response	109	24	86	29	225	40
1	46	10	32	11	70	13
2	70	16	37	13	89	16
3	55	12	44	15	38	7
4	30	7	14	5	28	5
5	34	8	22	8	30	5
6	12	3	12	4	16	3
7	14	3	6	2	5	1
8	7	2	4	1	8	1
9 or more	73	16	35	12	51	9
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100
Mean	6.3		5.3		3.9	
Median	3.0		3.0		2.0	
Mode	2.0		0		0	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding

Table 4-7 Number of Professional Articles, Papers, or Chapters Written or Co-authored in Past 5 Years Reported by 1972 and 1986 Respondents Grouped by UCEA Affiliation

	1972						1986					
	Respondents at UCEA Institutions N	% *	Respondents at Non UCEA Institutions N	%	All Respondents N	%	Respondents at UCEA Institutions N	%	Respondents at Non UCEA Institutions N	%	All Respondents N	%
None or no response	56	10	204	27	260	20	30	8	171	18	201	15
1-2	71	12	156	20	227	17	37	10	150	16	187	14
3-4	93	16	119	16	212	16	40	11	142	15	182	14
5-6	115	20	115	15	230	17	44	12	141	15	185	14
7-8	39	7	40	5	79	6	34	10	53	6	87	7
9-10	62	11	47	6	109	8	45	13	94	10	139	11
11-12	30	5	20	3	50	4	22	6	35	4	57	4
13-14	10	2	5	1	15	1	7	2	9	1	16	1
15-16	36	6	18	2	54	4	32	9	44	5	76	6
17-18	9	2	1	0	10	1	5	1	11	1	16	1
19-20	18	3	13	2	31	2	20	6	33	4	53	4
21 or more	37	6	19	3	56	4	43	12	60	6	103	8
Total	576	100	757	100	1,333	100	359	100	943	100	1,302	100
Mean							11.6		8.6		9.4	
Median							9.0		5.0		6.0	
Mode							10.0		2.0		2.0	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 4-8 Number of Professional Articles, Papers, or Chapters Written or Co-authored in Past 5 Years Reported by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, and Race

No. of Articles	Respondents at Research Institutions N	%*	Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions N	%	Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions N	%	Male Respondents N	%	Female Respondents N	%	Caucasian Respondents N	%	Minority Respondents N	%
None or no response	42	9	35	12	124	22	170	15	30	22	184	15	14	16
1-2	45	10	39	13	103	17	169	15	15	11	172	14	12	14
3-4	43	10	47	16	92	16	166	14	16	12	166	14	13	15
5-6	61	14	43	15	81	15	164	14	21	16	162	14	19	22
7-8	38	8	16	6	33	6	80	7	6	5	80	7	5	6
9-10	61	14	34	12	44	8	127	11	11	8	127	11	11	13
11-12	31	7	14	5	12	2	53	5	4	3	56	5	—	—
13-14	9	2	4	1	3	1	16	1	0	—	16	1	—	—
15-16	30	7	24	8	22	4	67	6	9	7	73	6	3	4
17-18	10	2	2	1	4	1	15	1	1	1	15	1	1	1
19-20	29	6	9	3	15	3	44	4	9	7	51	4	2	2
21 or more	51	12	25	8	27	5	89	8	13	9	96	9	6	7
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100
Mean	11.4		9.6		7.5		9.3		10.2		9.6		7.1	
Median	9.0		6.0		5.0		6.0		6.0		6.0		5.0	
Mode	10.0		10.0		3.0		10.0		2.0		2.0		6.0	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

The percentage of respondents reporting outside funding or released time for research declined between the 1972 (23%) and 1986 (19%) surveys. However, faculty at research and doctorate-granting institutions were more likely to receive such support in 1986 than were colleagues at comprehensive institutions (Table 4-9). A chi square analysis revealed no significant differences in the receipt of external funds based on gender, race, or length of time in the professoriate. However, there was a significant positive relationship between the receipt of external funds and the amount of time devoted to research ($x^2=33.87$, df=5, $p<.01$, not tabled).

We selected seven items pertaining to research from the faculty questionnaire to create a dependent variable labeled "research orientation." A varimax rotation analysis produced one factor with four variables: (a) perceived primary strength to be research, rather than teaching or service, (b) amount of time devoted to research, (c) preferred program orientation to be preparing professors/researchers rather than practitioners or a balance between preparing practitioners and professors/researchers, and (d) number of articles published within the last 5 years (see Appendix I). The factor loadings were then used to weight the variables to produce a score for each of the four variables. These factor scores were then aggregated to form the "research orientation" measure.

Table 4-9 Released Time or Outside Funding for Research Reported by 1972 Respondents and 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution

	1972		1986							
			Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		All Respondents	
Funds or Released Time	All Respondents N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	309	23	113	25	64	22	66	12	243	19
No	1,024	77	331	74	225	77	488	87	1,044	80
No response			6	1	3	1	6	1	15	1
Total	1,333	100	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,302	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

A word about the three variables dropped from the research orientation scale is warranted. Teaching a research methods course did not load on any factor, probably because so few educational administration faculty have this responsibility. Journal editing loaded on a separate factor; apparently this responsibility is not necessarily related to research and writing activities. Finally, obtaining external funds to support research and development projects also stood apart from other inquiry activities.

The regression analysis for all respondents produced an equation composed of 18 variables which accounted for about 34% of the variance in the research orientation of educational administration faculty (Table 4-10). Disagreement with the statement that former practitioners make the best professors was the best predictor of a strong research orientation. Also, faculty heavily committed to research devoted relatively little time to other activities such as university administration and consulting. The results of regression analyses of research orientation for subgroups of the educational administration professoriate (e.g., men and women, higher education and K-12 faculty, faculty at UCEA-member institutions and non-UCEA institutions) were similar to the equation for the entire group in that the same variables accounted for the variance (not tabled).

Familiarity with the literature keeps professors current with best practices in the field and emerging issues. Thus, regular review of pertinent professional journals is expected of professors. Respondents were asked to rank the three most important professional journals that they read regularly. As a group, educational administration faculty read many different journals; 14 periodicals received first choice votes from at least 1% of the respondents. The *Phi Delta Kappan*, a practitioner-oriented journal, was by far the most popular professional journal. Half of the 1986 respondents listed the *Kappan* among their first three choices of professional journals read regularly (Table 4-11), similar to the findings in 1972 (not tabled). The

second most popular journal, *Educational Administration Quarterly* (a research journal), was among the top three choices of only 19% of the 1986 respondents. However, faculty at UCEA institutions were more than twice as likely as their non-UCEA peers to indicate that the *EAQ* was their most important professional journal (14% compared to 6%, Table 4-12). Women were more likely than men to list *EAQ* first (13% compared with 8%). When the journals were categorized as either research- or practitioner-oriented, fewer than one fourth of the 1986 respondents indicated that a research journal was the most important periodical that they read regularly (not tabled).

Table 4-10 Multiple Regression Analysis on Research Orientation[a] for All Educational Administration Faculty (N=1,302)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Believe former practitioners make the best faculty	.298	.158	.127	190.77**
Believe quality teaching and research are interdependent	-.121	-.061	.150	36.51**
Percent of time spent teaching graduate students	-.055	-.524	.166	25.30**
Percent of time spent in university administration	-.053	-.498	.209	71.14**
Percent of time spent teaching undergraduate students	-.050	-.294	.228	32.48**
Percent of time spent consulting	-.052	-.215	.245	30.99**
Pressure to publish viewed as problem	.213	.091	.257	22.54**
Percent of time spent in "other" activities	-.051	-.172	.270	22.65**
Percent of time spent supervising doctoral work	-.034	-.155	.283	25.69**
Percent of time spent in committee work	-.045	-.139	.304	39.02**
Believe scholars in related fields make the best professors	-.190	-.084	.313	17.54**
Number of days per month editing journals	.142	.075	.319	13.77**
Poor intellectual climate viewed as problem	-.153	-.061	.326	13.05**
Number of meetings attended as a speaker	.076	.060	.330	8.59**
Number of books written in last 5 years	.019	.075	.333	6.93**
Faculty member 5 years or less	-.440	-.063	.336	7.65**
Lack of able students viewed as problem	-.153	-.057	.338	4.93*
Number of years since tenure granted	-.020	-.047	.340	4.13*

*p<.05
**p<.01
[a]Research orientation is composed of four items related to inquiry activities.

Table 4-11 Most Important Professional Journals to 1986 Respondents[a]

Journals	First Choice N	First Choice %	Second Choice N	Second Choice %	Third Choice N	Third Choice %
Phi Delta Kappan	376	29	164	13	105	8
Educational Administration Quarterly	110	8	67	5	51	6
Journal of Higher Education	43	3	35	3	20	2
Administrative Science Quarterly	44	3	35	3	13	1
National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin	35	3	43	3	36	3
Journal of Education Finance	35	3	25	2	5	—
American Educational Research Journal	25	2	17	1	22	2
Educational Research Quarterly	13	1	7	1	4	—
Journal of School Business Officials	12	1	5	—	1	—
Journal of College Student Personnel	10	1	4	—	4	—
Review of Higher Education	12	1	15	1	4	—
Change	11	1	13	1	14	1
Harvard Educational Review	8	1	19	2	22	2
Journal of Law & Education	10	1	12	1	3	—
Research in Higher Education	5	—	5	—	6	—
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis	5	—	10	1	10	1

[a]Sixteen most popular choices are reflected.

Teaching Activities

Faculty spend time doing what they like to do, so it was not surprising that the 1986 respondents devoted over two fifths of their time to teaching and advising graduate students. As noted previously, a large majority of the respondents considered teaching their primary strength and, as will be discussed in Chapter 5, teaching graduate students the most enjoyable aspect of the professorship. Thus, we expected faculty to devote a substantial portion of their time to this activity as did members of the 1972 cohort (Table 4-13).

Based on the discriminant analysis data comparing the responses of those who considered K-12 administration their primary focus with the information from higher education administration faculty, the portion of time spent with graduate students was the best single predictor of association with a K-12 program (see Appendix H). Faculty who identified with K-12 administration devoted more than 42% of their time to graduate students, while higher education faculty spent about one third of their time with graduate students.

Table 4-13 Most Important Professional Journal to 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation[a]

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Phi Delta Kappan	76	17	87	30	213	38	345	30	28	21	349	29	22	27	55	15	321	34	376	29
Educational Administration Quarterly	45	10	30	10	35	6	91	8	18	13	97	8	12	14	51	14	59	6	110	8
Journal of Higher Education	28	6	10	3	5	1	39	3	4	3	39	3	3	4	22	6	21	2	43	3
Administrative Science Quarterly	29	6	9	3	6	1	41	4	3	2	40	3	4	5	24	7	20	2	44	3
National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin	8	2	7	2	20	4	34	3	1	1	34	3	1	1	8	2	27	3	35	3
Journal of Education Finance	16	4	12	4	7	1	32	3	3	2	34	3	1	1	18	5	17	2	35	3
American Educational Research Journal	8	2	8	3	9	2	23	2	3	2	25	2	—	—	7	2	18	2	25	2
Educational Research Quarterly	5	1	3	1	5	1	12	1	1	1	12	1	1	1	4	1	9	1	13	1
Journal of School Business Officials	5	1	1	—	4	1	12	1	—	—	11	1	1	1	2	1	10	1	12	1
Journal of College Student Personnel	7	3	3	1	—	—	7	1	2	2	8	1	—	—	4	1	6	1	10	1
Review of Higher Education	9	2	2	1	1	—	10	1	2	2	12	1	—	—	6	2	6	1	12	1
Change	5	1	4	1	2	—	9	1	2	2	11	1	—	—	4	1	7	1	11	1
Harvard Educational Review	1	—	3	1	4	1	7	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	3	1	5	1	8	1
Journal of Law & Education	4	1	2	1	4	1	7	1	3	2	10	1	—	—	3	1	7	1	10	1
Research in Higher Education	2	—	1	—	2	—	5	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	2	1	3	—	5	—
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis	2	—	—	—	3	1	3	—	2	2	5	—	—	—	2	1	3	—	5	—

[a]Sixteen most popular choices are reflected.

Table 4-13 Portion of Time 1972 and 1986 Respondents Spent Teaching and Advising Graduate Students

	1972		1986	
Percentage of time	N	%*	N	%
None or no response	80	6	86	7
1-9	53	4	31	2
10-19	133	10	107	8
20-29	240	18	224	17
30-39	133	10	169	13
40-49	120	9	165	13
50-59	213	16	185	14
60-69	133	10	121	10
70-79	120	9	114	9
80-89	54	4	58	5
90-100	54	4	42	3
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean			41.4	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

The modal number of credit hours taught per term, six, did not change significantly between 1972 and 1986. Although the standard teaching load appeared to be approximately two courses per term, respondents at UCEA institutions and research institutions, on the average, taught fewer hours than did their colleagues elsewhere (Table 4-14). One quarter of the respondents from comprehensive institutions taught seven to nine hours per term, and almost one third (31%) taught 10 or more hours per term. Women on the average taught one more hour per term than did their male counterparts. The portion of faculty reporting no teaching assignment declined from 10% in 1972 to 6% in the 1986 study (not tabled).

The proportion of faculty members involved in undergraduate teaching decreased between 1972 and 1986; less than one fourth of the 1986 cohort (22%) indicated that they spent any time teaching and advising undergraduate students (compared with 34% in 1972, not tabled). When analyzed by type of institution, faculty members at comprehensive institutions indicated that they spent more time in undergraduate instruction (10%) than did their counterparts at research (3%) and doctorate-granting institutions (5%) (Table 4-15). As a group, men devoted slightly less time

to undergraduate teaching than did women, and minority faculty spent slightly more time in undergraduate instruction than did Caucasians.

Respondents in both 1972 and 1986 were asked how many times they had taught various courses in the preceding 3 years. Overall, the changes in teaching patterns between the two surveys were modest. The major change was that the proportion of faculty who had taught organizational theory at least three times in the preceding 3 years increased from 13% in 1972 to 19% in 1986 (Table 4-16). There also was a slight increase in the proportion who had taught school law and a slight decrease in the percentage who had taught the introductory course in K-12 administration.

Faculty who taught a small number of courses repeatedly were classified as "specialists," while those who taught a large number of different courses less frequently were considered "generalists." To test the hypothesis that faculty at research universities would more likely be specialists than their counterparts at other types of institutions, we used analysis of variance on teaching patterns. As predicted, faculty at research institutions exhibited a tendency toward specialization (M=4.68 different courses taught over the 3-year period), while their counterparts at doctorate-granting institutions (M=5.48) and at comprehensive institutions (M=5.82) tended to teach a larger number of different courses during the 3-year period (not tabled).

Faculty perceptions about the orientation of their educational administration programs changed between 1972 and 1986. Slightly over half of the 1972 cohort indicated that their educational administration programs were oriented more towards preparing practitioners, with the remainder indicating that their programs focused on the preparation of professors or on the preparation of both professors and practitioners (not tabled). In contrast, almost four fifths (78%) of the 1986 respondents reported that their programs were designed to prepare practitioners (see Chapter 5, Table 5-15). Women were more likely than men to perceive their programs as practitioner-oriented (84% compared to 78%), while faculty at research institutions (68%) were less likely than their counterparts at doctorate-granting institutions (79%) or comprehensive universities (86%) to characterize their programs as practitioner-oriented.

Supervision of student program and research committees constitutes another important part of a faculty member's instructional responsibilities. While half of the 1986 respondents were not involved in master's degree supervision, almost one tenth had been chairpersons of 26 or more master's committees during the prior 3 years (Table 4-17). About one third (32%) had chaired specialist degree (EdS) committees during this same time period (not tabled).

Faculty involvement in student doctoral committees increased between 1972 and 1986; 56% of the 1986 cohort (compared with 49% in 1972) had chaired doctoral student committees within the previous 3 years (Table 4-18). The 1986 respondents had chaired an average of seven doctoral committees during the 3-year period. Women and minority faculty tended to chair fewer doctoral committees (M=4.8 and 5.7, respectively). Eight percent of the 1986 respondents had chaired 16 or more doctoral committees within the preceding 3 years (Table 4-19).

Table 4-14 Credit Hours Taught per Term by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation*

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	22	5	24	8	37	7	71	6	12	9	78	7	5	6	20	6	63	7	83	6
1-3	96	21	49	17	74	13	198	17	18	13	204	17	11	13	77	22	142	15	219	17
4-6	206	46	79	27	138	25	372	32	49	36	389	33	27	31	173	48	250	27	423	33
7-9	91	20	106	36	138	25	306	26	29	22	308	26	24	28	65	18	270	29	333	26
10-12	26	6	30	10	145	26	179	15	21	16	180	15	18	21	18	5	183	19	201	15
13-15	4	1	1	—	26	5	28	2	2	1	29	2	1	1	2	1	29	3	31	2
16-18	1	—	1	—	2	—	3	—	1	—	4	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	4	—
19 or more	4	1	2	1	—	—	3	—	3	2	6	1	—	—	3	1	3	—	6	1
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100
Mean	6.4		7.5		8.2		7.4		8.2		7.4		7.7		6.3		7.8		7.5	
Mode	6.0		9.0		12.0		6.0		6.0		6.0		6.0		6.0		9.0		6.0	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 4-15 Portion of Time Spent Teaching Undergraduate Students by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
Percentage of Time	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	389	87	235	81	390	70	907	78	101	76	939	78	62	72	317	88	697	74	1,014	78
1-9	18	4	15	5	26	5	52	4	7	5	54	5	4	5	12	3	47	5	59	5
10-19	15	3	15	5	32	6	51	4	11	8	58	5	3	4	6	2	56	6	62	5
20-29	16	4	9	3	31	6	51	4	4	3	45	4	9	11	11	3	45	5	56	4
30-39	4	1	5	2	22	4	30	3	1	1	29	3	1	1	4	1	27	3	31	2
40-49	3	1	2	1	24	4	22	2	7	5	26	2	3	4	3	1	26	3	29	2
50 or more	5	1	11	4	35	6	47	4	4	4	47	4	4	5	6	2	45	5	51	4
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100
Mean	3.0		5.2		9.9		6.5		6.9		6.4		8.0		3.1		7.7		6.5	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 4-16 Portion of Faculty in 1972 and 1986 Who Taught Courses in Selected Content Areas at Least Three Times in Preceding 3 Years

	1972 Respondents		1986 Respondents	
Content Area	N	%	N	%
Community college administration	39	3	31	3
Education law	145	11	188	14
Personnel management	146	11	154	12
Education finance	169	13	173	13
Governance of higher education[a]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
Introduction to K-12 administration	327	25	286	22
Student personnel[a]	37	3		
Higher education administration	74	6	64	5
Organizational theory	176	13	247	19
Planning in education	87	7	99	8
Politics of education	53	4	76	6
Research methods	180	14	198	15
School-community relations	116	9	123	9
Supervision of instruction	266	20	244	19
Elementary school administration[b]	155	12		
Secondary school administration[b]	208	16		

[a]These content areas were not included in 1972 survey.
[b]These content areas were not included in 1986 survey.

Based on the discriminant analysis of faculty characteristics at UCEA-member and non-UCEA institutions, the most powerful predictor of UCEA membership was the amount of time devoted to supervising doctoral work. UCEA faculty spent about 15% of their time with doctoral students compared with about 8% for faculty at non-UCEA institutions (see Appendix H). Similarly, the best predictor of employment at a research institution was the amount of time spent supervising doctoral work. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents at research universities and 85% at UCEA-member institutions had chaired at least one doctoral committee within the past 3 years.

Table 4-17 Master's Committees Chaired in Past Three Years by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

Committees Chaired	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	196	44	167	57	291	52	571	49	80	59	602	50	43	50	171	48	483	51	654	50
1 - 5	115	26	31	11	75	12	194	17	25	19	195	16	21	24	89	25	132	14	221	17
6 - 10	52	12	29	10	50	9	118	10	12	9	125	10	5	6	38	11	93	10	131	10
11 - 15	23	5	14	5	36	7	68	6	5	4	66	6	5	6	16	5	57	6	73	6
16 - 20	18	4	14	5	38	7	65	6	5	4	67	6	3	4	14	4	56	6	70	5
21 - 25	11	2	4	1	11	2	25	2	1	1	26	2	—	—	7	2	19	2	26	2
26 or more	35	7	33	11	59	11	119	11	7	5	117	10	9	11	24	7	103	11	127	10
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100
Mean	9.0		12.9		12.9		11.9		8.1		11.5		12.1		8.9		12.4		11.5	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 4-18 Doctoral Committees Chaired in Preceding Three Years by 1972 and 1986 Respondents

	1972 Respondents		1986 Respondents	
Committees Chaired	N	%*	N	%
None or no response	676	51	579	44
1-5	267	20	281	22
6-10	178	13	210	16
11-15	85	6	113	9
16-20	42	3	63	5
21-25	35	3	21	2
26 or more	50	4	35	3
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean			7.4	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Service Activities

The profile of service activities suggested that educational administration faculty members were involved in a range of professional activities which extended beyond the campus (Table 4-20). For example, 74% served one or more days per month as consultants; 12% devoted six or more days per month to consulting activities. One fifth devoted at least one day a month to editorial activities for professional journals. About 84% reported that they attended one or more professional meetings a month, and 42% delivered guest lectures at least one day per month. With the exception of speaking engagements, there were no appreciable differences in the average amount of time devoted to these professional activities when the respondents were grouped by type of institution, UCEA affiliation, gender, or race (not tabled).

Faculty reported making formal presentations at an average of 2.6 meetings during the past year (Table 4-21). Faculty from research (21%), doctorate-granting (18%), or UCEA-member institutions (22%) were more likely to have made four or more presentations in the past year than were their counterparts at comprehensive universities (11%) or non-UCEA institutions (14%). As discussed in Chapter 7, faculty research orientation was correlated with the number of speaking engagements in the past year.

Table 4-19 Doctoral Committees Chaired in Preceding Three Years by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

Committees Chaired	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	59	13	81	28	439	78	502	43	73	54	522	44	48	56	53	15	526	56
1-5	145	32	91	31	45	8	246	21	35	26	258	22	20	23	124	35	157	17
6-10	110	25	66	23	34	6	194	17	15	11	197	16	10	12	88	25	122	13
11-15	61	14	29	10	23	4	108	9	5	4	109	9	3	4	46	13	67	7
16-20	36	8	13	4	14	3	56	5	6	4	59	5	3	4	28	8	35	4
21-25	13	3	6	2	2	0	21	2	—	—	20	2	1	1	5	2	16	2
26 or more	26	6	6	2	3	1	33	3	1	1	33	3	1	1	15	4	20	2
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100
Mean	9.7		7.1		4.0		7.6		4.8		7.5		5.7		8.7		6.7	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 4-20 Days per Month Devoted to Selected Professional Activities by 1986 Respondents

	Consulting		Attending Professional Meetings		Guest Lecturing		Editing Journals	
Average No. of Days per Month	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 or no response	341	26	206	16	758	58	1,036	80
1	304	23	497	38	316	24	134	10
2	210	16	231	18	94	7	47	4
3	97	8	82	6	39	3	21	2
4	120	9	49	4	21	2	15	1
5	81	6	65	5	41	3	23	2
6	16	1	20	2	7	1	5	—
7	6	1	7	1	1	—	—	—
8	12	1	19	2	1	—	—	—
9 or more	115	9	126	10	24	2	21	2
Total	1,302	100	1,302	100	1,302	100	1,302	100
Mean	3.2		2.2		1.8		1.6	
Mode	1.0		1.0		1.0		0	
Median	2.2		1.7		1.2		0.9	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Faculty were asked to rank their three most important professional associations. Over 20 different associations were mentioned, and none captured a majority of the respondents. The most frequent first choice was the American Educational Research Association (AERA); 16% of the 1986 cohort named AERA as their primary professional association (Table 4-22). Women were twice as likely as men to list AERA as their most important affiliation. Also, faculty from UCEA institutions were more than twice as likely as their non-UCEA counterparts to indicate AERA as their primary professional association. The American Association of School Administrators was the second most popular choice, followed by Phi Delta Kappa and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents listed Phi Delta Kappa among their three most important professional associations, compared with 27% who listed AERA among their three most important affiliations (Table 4-23). Over one quarter (27%) of the respondents had held an office in at least one of their three most important professional associations (not tabled).

Table 4-21 Number of Meetings Where 1986 Respondents Were Speakers During Prior Year with Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

No. of Meetings	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 or no response	118	26	85	29	232	41	394	34	36	27	400	33	26	30	101	28	334	35	435	33
1-3	238	53	154	53	265	47	582	50	74	55	605	51	46	53	179	50	478	51	657	51
4-8	79	18	40	14	47	8	144	12	21	16	150	13	13	15	61	17	105	11	166	13
9 or more	15	3	13	4	16	3	40	3	4	3	43	4	1	1	18	5	26	3	44	3
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302[a]	100
Mean	2.8		2.8		2.3		2.6		2.9		2.6		2.4		2.9		2.5		2.6	
Mode	2.0		3.0		2.0		2.0		3.0		2.0		3.0		2.0		2.0		2.0	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a]The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 4-22 Preferred Professional Association of 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation[a]

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Educational Research Association	118	26	36	12	54	10	166	14	41	30	191	16	15	17	101	28	107	11	208	16
American Association of School Administrators	35	8	47	16	79	14	151	13	9	7	152	13	6	7	21	6	140	15	161	12
Phi Delta Kappa	15	3	29	10	70	13	107	9	7	5	103	9	9	11	9	3	105	11	114	9
Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development	26	6	18	6	65	12	95	8	13	10	96	8	10	12	14	4	95	10	109	8
National Organization on Legal Problems of Education	20	4	13	5	20	4	47	4	6	4	51	4	2	2	11	3	42	5	53	4
National Council for Professors of Educational Administration	13	3	9	3	21	4	42	4	1	1	40	3	3	4	10	3	33	4	43	3
Association for Study of Higher Education	27	6	10	3	4	1	35	3	6	4	41	3	—	—	22	6	19	2	41	3
American Education Finance Association	21	5	8	3	6	1	32	3	3	2	35	3	—	—	22	6	13	1	35	3
American Association of Higher Education	8	2	9	3	8	1	20	2	5	4	22	2	2	3	10	3	15	2	25	2
University Council for Educational Administration	5	1	4	1	3	1	12	1	—	—	10	1	2	3	9	3	3	—	12	1

[a]Ten most popular choices are reflected.

Educational administration faculty in 1986 were less involved in university committee work than were their 1972 counterparts, perhaps reflecting the increasing bureaucratization in higher education and erosion of collegial governance (Austin & Gamson, 1983). The 1986 respondents spent an average of only 7% of their time in university committee work (Table 4-24). More than one third devoted no time to university committee work. In fact, as will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, institutional governance and other kinds of committee work were perceived to be the least enjoyable aspect of the professorship.

Table 4-23 Most Important Professional Associations of 1986 Respondents[a]

	First Choice		Second Choice		Third Choice	
Associations	N	%	N	%	N	%
American Educational Research Association	208	16	94	7	53	4
Phi Delta Kappa	114	9	118	9	130	10
American Association of School Administrators	161	12	84	7	36	3
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development	109	8	122	9	77	6
National Organization on Legal Problems of Education	53	4	34	3	9	1
National Council for Professors of Educational Admin.	43	3	39	3	24	2
Association for Study of Higher Education	41	3	29	2	10	1
American Education Finance Association	35	3	22	2	8	1
American Association of Higher Education	25	2	29	2	11	1
University Council for Educational Administration	12	1	14	1	5	—

[a]Ten most popular choices are reflected.

Table 4-24 Portion of Time 1972 and 1986 Respondents Spent in University Committee Work

	1972		1986	
Percentage of time	N	%[a]	N	%
None or no response	346	26	446	34
1-5	320	24	400	31
6-10	320	24	296	23
11-15	107	8	54	4
16-20	120	9	58	5
21-25	53	4	18	1
26 or more	67	5	30	3
Total	1,333	100	1,302	100
Mean			6.8	

[a] Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

However, women spent more time than men in committee work (Table 4-25), perhaps because of institutional norms requiring female representation on committees. With fewer women available, women must spend more time per person than men in such activities. Faculty who identified K-12 administration as their level of concentration spent more time in committee work and consulting activities than did higher education faculty who devoted more of their time to university administration (see Appendix H).

Summary

The typical educational administration faculty member taught two courses per term, chaired seven doctoral committees in the past 3 years, spent 10% of the work week supervising doctoral students and 12% in research activities, did not receive external funding or released time for research, devoted 3 days per month to consulting activities, and made presentations at approximately three meetings each year.

In general, the professional activities of the educational administration faculty did not change significantly between 1972 and 1986. Most faculty in both cohorts considered teaching to be their primary professorial strength. However, when compared with their 1972 counterparts, the 1986 respondents spent less time with undergraduate students and devoted more time to research. Based on their instructional assignments, faculty at research universities and UCEA-member institutions were more likely to be specialists while colleagues at other types of institutions tended to be generalists.

Research productivity has increased among educational administration faculty members, reflecting the general trend toward more rigorous promotion and tenure standards, particularly at research institutions. Research productivity was greater among faculty at UCEA-member and research institutions. However, the average amount of time devoted to research (12% of the work week) did not compare favorably with the mean for faculty across disciplines (18%, Carnegie Foundation, 1984), even though educational administration faculty have practically no undergraduate instructional responsibilities.

An increase in reported research activity does not necessarily mean that significant contributions to the literature are being made. Indeed, the quality of research in educational administration has been the focus of criticism (Boyan, 1981; Griffiths, 1983; Hoy, 1982). Also, the range of professional journals and associations listed as "primary" by the 1986 respondents suggests that there is no unifying literature base or professional affiliation that characterizes the educational administration professoriate.

A troubling finding was the small amount of faculty time spent in committee work, including institutional governance and program reform activities. Time is a finite resource. Faculty cannot increase their time commitment to research without reducing the amount of effort spent in other activities. Thus, some of the time previously spent in committee work has probably been reallocated to research. Implications of this shift for preparation programs are discussed in some detail in Chapter 8.

Table 4-25 Portion of Time Spent in University Committee Work by 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

Percentage of Time	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no resonse	147	33	109	37	190	34	401	35	40	30	405	34	31	36	121	34	325	35	446	34
1-5	151	34	88	30	161	29	358	30	42	31	371	31	28	33	111	31	289	31	400	31
6-10	106	24	61	21	129	23	266	23	28	21	269	23	20	23	87	24	209	22	296	23
11-15	14	3	14	5	26	5	44	4	10	7	52	4	2	2	13	4	41	4	54	4
16-20	14	3	13	5	31	6	51	4	7	5	54	5	4	5	16	5	42	4	58	5
21-25	5	1	5	2	8	1	16	1	2	1	17	1	1	1	6	2	12	1	18	1
26 or more	13	2	2	1	15	3	24	2	6	5	30	3	—	—	5	1	25	3	30	4
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	101
Mean	6.8		6.3		7.2		6.7		7.8		7.0		7.4		6.6		6.9		6.8	

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 5 ❖❖❖

PROFESSORIAL VALUES AND CAREER SATISFACTION

What do educational administration faculty value in their own careers? What do they believe about their academic field? What forces are shaping the quality of life and the nature of discourse among these professors? This chapter reports changes in values and beliefs from 1972 to 1986, considers explanations for the changes, and briefly discusses relationships to larger trends affecting academe. The themes of continuity and change in the educational administration professoriate will become evident as will some similarities and dissimilarities with professors in other academic fields.

What Faculty Value in Their Careers

Reasons for Choosing the Professorship

In both 1972 and 1986, respondents were asked to rank order five factors that attracted them to the professorship, and the responses changed little overall. The 1986 cohort rated an interest in teaching highest, followed in order by an interest in ideas and the extension of knowledge, the example of professors in their own doctoral programs, and the independence professors enjoy in their work (Table 5-1). Only about 1% of the faculty reported that the prestige of the professorship was a factor in their choice. Faculty at research institutions ranked an interest in ideas as their primary reason (Table 5-2), whereas those at doctorate-granting institutions

and especially those at comprehensive institutions were drawn to a professorial role primarily because of an interest in teaching.

Table 5-1 Most Important Factors in Entering the Professorship Reported by 1986 Faculty

	First Factor N	% *	Second Factor N	%	Third Factor N	%
Interest in teaching	404	31	256	20	177	14
Interest in ideas	313	24	307	24	173	13
Professor in doctoral program	211	16	131	10	140	11
Independence of professor	143	11	236	18	296	23
Prestige of the professorship	10	1	37	3	99	8
Other	55	4	14	1	42	3
No response	166	13	321	25	375	29
Total	1,302	100	1,302	100	1,302	100

* Percentage may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Professors from minority groups were somewhat less drawn by teaching and role independence and more attracted by an interest in ideas and the example of professors in their own doctoral programs. Comparing respondents on the basis of gender, females were more likely to be drawn to the professoriate by an interest in ideas (33% compared to 23% of males), whereas men were more attracted by teaching (32% compared to 21% of females).

The Lure of Other Positions

When weighing a job offer from another institution (Table 5-3), faculty viewed a significant increase in salary as the most important consideration (32%), with a more attractive geographic location and more stimulating colleagues tied for second (14%). More support for research was the most important factor to 8% of the cohort, while opportunities for field service (5%), a promotion in academic rank (4%), and more able students (3%) had relatively little appeal. These responses differed somewhat from 1972 when only 23% ranked a significant increase in salary first, but 13% considered the opportunity to participate in field studies as the top factor, and 10% found a promotion in academic rank the prime consideration (not tabled). Clearly, the precipitous drop in the purchasing power of academic salaries during these years has made compensation a much more important issue among faculty.

Table 5-2 Most Important Factor in Entering the Professorship Reported by 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interest in teaching	106	24	79	27	219	39	375	32	28	21	374	31	24	28	80	22	324	34	404	31
Interest in ideas and the extension of knowledge	130	29	73	25	110	20	267	23	45	33	288	24	23	27	104	29	209	22	313	24
Professor in doctoral program	84	19	54	19	73	13	187	16	22	16	190	16	18	21	70	20	141	15	211	16
Independence of professorship	54	12	33	11	56	10	126	11	16	12	135	11	7	8	43	12	100	11	143	11
Prestige of the professorship	4	1	4	1	2	—	9	1	1	1	9	1	1	1	5	1	5	1	10	1
Other	19	4	11	4	25	5	47	4	7	5	52	4	2	2	16	5	39	4	55	4
No response	53	12	38	13	75	13	149	13	16	12	150	12	11	13	41	11	125	13	166	13
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 5-3 Most Important Factor in Considering Career Change Reported by 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A significant salary increase	119	26	83	28	208	37	374	32	36	27	375	31	31	36	90	25	320	34	410	32
More stimulating colleagues	69	15	43	15	72	13	156	13	26	19	166	14	14	16	63	18	121	13	184	14
More able students	17	4	6	2	11	2	30	3	4	3	30	3	3	4	13	4	21	2	34	3
More support for research	46	10	22	8	29	5	79	7	18	13	90	8	6	7	41	11	56	6	97	8
More opportunities to engage in field service projects	16	4	23	8	31	6	64	6	6	4	65	5	5	6	11	3	59	6	70	5
A promotion in academic rank	17	4	14	5	15	3	38	3	8	6	41	3	5	6	17	5	29	3	46	4
A more attractive geographical area	67	15	36	12	75	13	164	14	13	10	169	14	8	9	54	15	124	13	178	14
Other	17	4	20	7	39	7	68	6	8	6	73	6	3	4	15	4	61	7	76	6
No response	82	18	45	15	80	14	187	16	16	12	189	16	11	13	55	15	152	16	207	16
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	109	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

The decline in the proportion who viewed advancement in rank as a chief consideration can be explained in part by the greater number of academics who now hold senior rank.

Faculty members at research universities and UCEA-member institutions found salary increases somewhat less attractive in assessing a job offer, probably because they already had relatively high salaries; however, compared with counterparts elsewhere, they found the prospects of additional research support and stimulating colleagues to be more appealing. Professors at doctorate-granting universities showed the greatest interest in opportunities for field service, and those at comprehensive institutions—more than any other subgroup of respondents—were interested in a salary increase.

Despite generally lower salaries and lower academic ranks, female faculty attached less importance to salary (27% vs. 32%) and geographic location (10% vs. 14%) than did men. But women were more interested than men in research opportunities (13% vs. 7%) and stimulating colleagues (19% vs. 13%) when considering a job change. Only 6% of the women rated promotion in rank as a primary consideration in assessing a job offer, even though far fewer women were tenured or at senior rank. Faculty from minority groups were markedly less concerned about geographic location and more interested in salary and the caliber of colleagues.

Most and Least Enjoyable Aspects of Faculty Careers

When asked to cite the "most enjoyed" aspect of their work, 50% of the respondents mentioned teaching graduate students, followed by 13% who mentioned research and writing and 9% who noted consulting activities (Table 5-4). Supervising doctoral students and directing programs were the most enjoyable activities for 6%, and only 4% mentioned teaching undergraduates first. At UCEA-member universities, 41% regarded teaching graduate students as the most satisfying aspect of their work, followed by 22% (nearly double the mean for all respondents) who found research and writing their primary source of professional satisfaction. Female faculty were much more likely than males to rank research and writing as the most enjoyable aspect of their role (21% vs. 12%).

For some reason, nearly one fifth of the minority faculty chose not to answer this question; but among those who did respond, only 7% cited research and writing as their primary source of fulfillment. Minority group faculty were also significantly less attracted to consulting.

More than half of the respondents indicated the *least* satisfying aspect of the professorship was committee work; no other item captured more than 15% of the respondents (Table 5-5). It came as no surprise that very few (1%) regarded teaching graduate students as the least preferred activity. Most professors were drawn to academe by teaching and the vast majority continue to regard teaching as their most rewarding activity. Yet institutional expectations for research and scholarly contributions remain high, so the conditions for role conflict are clearly present.

Table 5-4 Aspect of the Professorship Most Enjoyed with Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching undergraduates	6	1	11	4	40	7	49	4	8	6	47	4	7	8	5	1	52	6	57	4
Teaching graduate students	180	40	137	47	334	60	589	51	58	43	605	51	40	47	147	41	504	53	651	50
Supervising doctoral students	40	9	32	11	11	2	73	6	10	7	77	6	5	6	26	7	57	6	83	6
Research and writing	95	21	32	11	37	7	136	12	28	21	158	13	6	7	79	22	85	9	164	13
Consulting	59	13	23	8	36	6	109	9	9	7	116	10	2	2	41	11	77	8	118	9
Committee work	4	1	1	—	5	1	10	1	—	—	10	1	—	—	2	1	8	1	10	1
Directing programs/ projects	28	6	19	7	32	6	67	6	12	9	71	6	7	8	21	6	58	6	79	6
Other	4	1	3	1	2	—	9	1	—	—	7	1	2	2	4	1	5	1	9	1
No response	34	8	34	12	63	11	118	10	10	7	107	9	17	20	34	10	97	10	131	10
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Table 5-5 Aspect of the Professorship Least Enjoyed with Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching undergraduates	15	3	15	5	18	3	44	4	4	3	43	4	5	6	12	3	36	4	48	4
Teaching graduate students	8	2	3	1	2	—	12	1	1	1	13	1	—	—	3	1	10	1	13	1
Supervising doctoral students	19	4	6	2	10	2	31	3	4	3	32	3	3	4	18	5	17	2	35	3
Research and writing	57	13	34	12	103	18	183	16	11	8	186	16	6	7	41	11	153	16	194	15
Consulting	22	5	11	4	17	3	40	3	10	7	44	4	5	6	20	6	30	3	50	4
Committee work	231	51	163	56	279	50	596	51	74	55	620	52	44	51	193	54	480	51	673	52
Directing programs/projects	34	8	22	8	41	7	92	8	4	3	89	7	7	8	25	7	72	6	97	8
Other	15	3	5	2	16	3	32	3	4	3	35	3	1	1	12	3	24	3	36	3
No response	49	11	33	11	74	13	130	11	23	17	36	11	15	17	35	10	121	13	56	12
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

* Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

Valued Collegial Relationships

When asked to whom they typically turned for advice about a serious professional concern, over half the men identified a colleague in their own department, whereas this was true of slightly over one fourth of the women (not tabled). Females were more than twice as likely to turn to a colleague at another university (31% compared to 15%) and somewhat more likely to turn to a family member or an administrator. Minorities did not vary from Caucasians nearly as much as women did from men. But minority faculty were somewhat less likely to turn to a colleague in their department and slightly more inclined to turn to a colleague at another university or a family member. Although the pattern did not change greatly between 1972 and 1986, the percentage of faculty who would turn to an administrator dropped from 15% to 8% (perhaps a symptom of strained relationships in an era of retrenchment), and the number who would turn to a colleague at another university increased slightly from 12% to 15%.

Problems That Concern Faculty

In both 1972 and 1986, faculty were offered a list of potential problems affecting their roles and asked to rank them on a 4-point scale from "very serious" to "no problem." The proportion of faculty who regarded the lack of university support for their departments as a very serious or rather serious problem increased from 1972 to 1986 (32% to 42%, Table 5-6). Similarly, those who thought that teaching and advising loads were too heavy and believed that pressure to publish scholarly work was too great increased respectively from 36% to 42% and from 25% to 34%. A substantial proportion of faculty (38%) in 1986 regarded the level of salaries at their own institutions to be a very serious or rather serious problem, an increase from 27% in 1972. Comparable percentages of both cohorts indicated that the small proportion of women and minorities in the professorship was a very serious or rather serious problem (38% in 1986; 36% in 1972).

Most of the other problems posed to faculty in both 1972 and 1986 elicited similar responses in the two studies. But the quality of the intellectual climate in departments was cited as a very serious or rather serious problem by over one quarter of the 1986 respondents, up noticeably from 1972. Of the issues listed for the first time in the 1986 survey, the growing regulatory power of states over graduate educational administration programs was considered a very serious or rather serious problem by 43% of the faculty; the politics of academic life was cited by 42%; and the rising age of faculty was noted by 37%. Coupled with the sizeable proportion (29%) of faculty who felt that they lacked colleagueship in their departments, signs of alienation and isolation within the professoriate were apparent. Clearly, the proportion of faculty who regarded themselves as overworked, underpaid, and underappreciated increased from 1972 to 1986; nevertheless, *none* of the listed problems was regarded as very serious or rather serious by even half of the 1986 cohort.

Table 5-6 Perceptions of Selected Problems among Educational Administration Faculty in 1972 and 1986 (Reported in Percentages)

	1972 Respondents (N=1,333)					1986 Respondents (N=1,302)				
	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Lack of university support for my department in relation to other departments in my institution	14	18	30	36	2	20	22	32	24	3
Difficulty in placing students in administrative positions	2	13	39	44	2	2	10	34	52	3
Difficulty in placing students in the professorship	8	18	32	34	9	9	15	25	37	14
Heavy teaching and advising load in my department	15	21	30	32	2	21	21	27	28	3
Pressure to publish scholarly work	9	16	29	44	2	14	20	30	33	3
Lack of able students	5	17	39	37	2	9	20	40	28	3
Low level of salaries in my department	10	17	38	34	2	16	22	39	20	3
Inferior quality of discourse at professional meetings I attend	8	20	37	33	2	7	19	37	32	5
Lack of appropriate competency standards for students in graduate programs	9	24	39	27	2	6	20	39	32	4
Professors spending too much time in private consulting	5	10	29	54	2	6	11	31	49	4
Small proportion of women and minorities in our profession	15	21	31	29	5	18	20	32	26	4
Poor intellectual climate in my department	5	11	27	55	2	10	17	33	37	4
Pressure to submit proposals and acquire external funds*						9	19	33	36	4
Growing regulatory power of states in graduate programs in our field*						22	21	31	23	4
Residency requirements that result in declining enrollments*						5	13	29	48	5
Increase in off-campus teaching assignments*						6	13	30	47	4
The "politics" of academic life*						17	25	34	21	3
Quality faculty leaving academe*						6	14	32	45	4
Lack of collegueship in my department*						12	17	28	39	4
Rising average age of professors*						11	26	34	26	4

*These items were not listed on the 1972 survey.

The problems *least* often cited as very serious or rather serious in 1986 were: the difficulty of placing students in administrative posts (12%), the amount of time professors spent in private consulting (17%), residency requirements that resulted in declining enrollments (18%), and increased off-campus teaching assignments (19%). The possibility that valued colleagues would leave the professorship for positions outside of academe was considered to be a very serious or rather serious threat by just one fifth of the respondents.

Female faculty were noticeably more concerned about the small proportion of minorities and women in the profession, the lack of colleagueship in their departments, the rising age of their colleagues, and the prospect of losing colleagues to positions outside of academe (Table 5-7). Compared with their male counterparts, women also were more likely to perceive as problems the intellectual climate and heavy teaching/advising loads in their departments. They also expressed more concern about salaries, which is understandable since women as a group made considerably less than men (see Chapter 3).

Minority faculty were more likely than Caucasians to be concerned about the rising age of their colleagues, the lack of colleagueship in their departments, the politics of academic life, and especially the small proportion of women and minorities in the profession. The low level of salaries and the placement of students in administrative positions were also matters of somewhat greater concern to minorities than to Caucasians. However, minority faculty were generally less concerned about the regulatory power of state governments and heavy teaching/advising loads in their departments.

Faculty located at UCEA-member universities were less concerned about the politics of academic life, the increased regulatory power of states, salary levels, pressure to publish, and the weight of teaching and advising loads. They also felt that their departments were better supported by their institutions. On the other hand, UCEA faculty voiced greater concern than did their non-UCEA counterparts about the lack of able students, the amount of time their colleagues spent in private consulting, the small proportion of women and minorities in their ranks, and the intellectual climate in their departments. Faculty at UCEA-member institutions were also somewhat more concerned about the quality of colleagueship in their departments and the rising age of the professoriate.

Career Satisfaction

According to Locke (1976), there are two reasons for being concerned with the phenomenon of job satisfaction. "First, it can be viewed as an end in itself, since happiness, after all, is the goal of life. Secondly, it can be studied because it contributes to other attitudes and outcomes" (p. 1328). Modifying Locke's definition of job satisfaction for purposes of this study, we defined satisfaction as the attainment of values that are compatible with educational administration faculty members' needs and expectations.

Career Satisfaction Versus Present Morale

Distinctions have been made between satisfaction and morale (Locke, 1976). Satisfaction reflects a sense of well-being related to one's work and an index of the degree to which individuals feel good about their commitment to their vocation. Morale refers to an individual's perceptions of whether his or her expectations are being met by the work environment and is a "goodness of fit" measure with the norms of the institution or department (Austin & Gamson, 1983). When asked if they would become professors of educational administration again, 90% of the

Table 5-7 Perceptions of Selected Problems among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents at Research Institutions (N=450)					Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=292)					Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=560)					Male Respondents (N=1,160)					Female Respondents (N=135)				
	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Lack of university support for my department in relation to other departments in my institution	22	24	33	19	2	18	20	32	27	2	18	21	31	26	3	20	22	32	24	2	19	22	31	24	4
Difficulty in placing students in administrative positions	2	8	30	57	3	1	9	31	56	2	2	11	39	45	3	2	10	35	52	3	2	7	31	55	4
Difficulty in placing students in the professorship	9	19	36	30	6	11	21	24	36	9	8	8	18	43	23	9	15	26	37	13	10	10	22	36	21
Heavy teaching and advising load in my department	18	16	30	33	2	27	22	22	27	2	20	25	27	24	4	20	21	28	28	3	30	21	19	25	4
Pressure to publish scholarly work	13	21	28	35	3	20	19	30	30	3	12	20	32	32	3	14	20	30	32	3	10	20	31	34	5
Lack of able students	12	22	36	27	3	7	16	43	32	3	8	21	42	26	3	9	21	40	28	3	7	19	42	24	5
Low level of salaries in my department	12	23	39	23	3	18	20	37	22	3	17	22	40	17	3	15	21	40	21	3	19	29	33	13	6
Inferior quality of discourse at professional meetings I attend	9	18	38	32	4	8	20	37	34	5	6	18	39	32	5	7	19	38	32	4	6	16	31	39	8
Lack of appropriate competency standards for students in graduate programs	6	20	41	30	4	7	20	32	38	3	5	19	42	30	4	6	20	40	32	3	7	17	39	31	6
Professors spending too much time in private consulting	8	10	32	46	4	5	11	35	45	4	4	11	27	54	4	6	11	31	49	4	4	11	32	47	5

Table 5-7 (Continued) Perceptions of Selected Problems among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents at Research Institutions (N=450)					Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=292)					Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=560					Male Respondents (N=1,160)					Female Respondents (N=135)				
	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Small proportion of women and minorities in our profession	21	22	32	20	4	21	19	32	25	3	14	19	32	31	4	14	21	34	29	3	50	18	20	5	7
Poor intellectual climate in my dept.	11	18	31	36	3	10	16	33	38	3	8	17	34	36	5	9	17	33	37	3	13	22	28	32	4
Pressure to submit proposals and acquire external funds	12	18	34	32	4	14	20	33	30	3	5	18	31	42	4	9	18	32	37	3	9	21	36	28	7
Growing regulatory power of states in graduate programs in our field	16	22	33	26	4	27	21	28	21	3	23	21	31	21	5	21	21	31	23	3	24	20	30	18	9
Residency requirements that result in declining enrollments	6	16	33	42	4	8	13	31	44	5	4	11	25	54	6	5	13	29	48	4	6	12	30	46	7
Increase in off-campus teaching assignments	4	14	31	47	4	9	14	32	43	3	6	12	27	50	4	6	12	30	49	4	9	21	25	39	7
The "politics" of academic life	15	24	36	22	3	19	28	34	17	2	17	24	34	21	4	17	24	34	22	3	15	33	36	13	4
Quality faculty leaving academe	6	12	32	47	3	7	16	29	46	3	6	14	33	43	5	6	14	31	46	4	14	10	36	36	4
Lack of collegueship in my department	15	18	32	33	3	12	16	25	45	2	11	17	26	41	5	12	17	28	40	3	19	22	26	29	4
Rising average age of professors	14	27	30	25	4	8	25	40	24	3	10	26	33	27	4	10	26	34	27	3	16	24	31	22	4

Table 5-7 (Continued) Perceptions of Selected Problems among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Caucasian Respondents (N=1,198)					Minority Respondents (N=86)					UCEA Respondents (N=359)					Non-UCEA Respondents (N=943)				
	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Lack of university support for my department in relation to other departments in my institution	20	22	32	24	2	22	23	27	24	4	17	23	35	23	2	20	22	31	24	3
Difficulty in placing students in administrative positions	2	9	35	52	3	4	13	35	45	4	2	8	34	54	2	2	10	34	51	3
Difficulty in placing students in the professorship	9	15	25	37	14	12	11	28	35	15	8	21	35	30	6	9	12	23	39	17
Heavy teaching and advising load in my department	22	21	27	28	3	15	26	30	24	5	16	16	30	35	2	23	23	26	25	4
Pressure to publish scholarly work	14	20	30	34	3	15	17	37	26	5	9	19	32	37	3	16	21	30	31	3
Lack of able students	9	21	40	27	3	11	12	38	35	5	12	24	38	22	3	7	19	41	30	3
Low level of salaries in my dept.	15	21	40	20	3	21	28	28	20	4	13	25	39	23	3	17	21	39	19	4
Inferior quality of discourse at professional meetings I attend	7	19	38	33	4	9	19	31	33	8	7	18	41	31	3	7	19	36	33	5
Lack of appropriate competency standards for students in graduate programs	6	20	40	31	3	7	17	28	43	5	6	23	40	28	3	6	18	39	33	4
Professors spending too much time in private consulting	6	11	30	50	3	9	7	34	42	8	8	11	34	44	3	5	11	29	51	4

Table 5-7 (Continued) Perceptions of Selected Problems among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Caucasian Respondents (N=1,198)					Minority Respondents (N=86)					UCEA Respondents (N=359)					Non-UCEA Respondents (N=943)				
	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Small proportion of women and minorities in our profession	16	21	33	27	3	42	9	26	16	7	21	26	32	18	3	17	18	32	29	4
Poor intellectual climate in my dept.	9	17	33	37	3	14	15	30	36	5	11	19	32	36	3	9	17	33	37	4
Pressure to submit proposals and acquire external funds	9	18	33	37	3	9	30	28	26	7	9	16	36	35	3	9	19	31	36	4
Growing regulatory power of states in graduate programs in our field	22	21	31	23	3	19	26	26	24	6	17	22	34	24	3	23	21	30	22	4
Residency requirements that result in declining enrollments	5	13	30	48	4	11	17	21	47	5	6	16	34	41	3	5	12	27	50	5
Increase in off-campus teaching assignments	6	13	29	48	4	6	15	33	42	5	6	10	33	48	4	6	14	28	47	4
The "politics" of academic life	17	25	34	22	3	20	22	43	11	5	12	23	38	24	3	19	26	33	19	3
Quality faculty leaving academe	6	13	32	46	3	7	21	33	35	5	6	11	34	47	2	6	14	31	44	4
Lack of colleagueship in my dept.	12	17	28	40	3	15	20	26	35	5	15	18	31	35	2	12	17	27	41	4
Rising average age of professors	11	26	34	26	3	16	26	33	22	4	13	31	31	23	3	10	24	35	27	4

faculty in 1972 and 92% in 1980 (Newell & Morgan, 1980) responded affirmatively. However, the percentage dropped to 84% in 1986. Still, only about one professor in six entertained second thoughts about his or her career choice. Given this strong *underlying* satisfaction with their profession, the number of faculty who expressed serious concern about the quality of their working conditions and the level of their pay takes on greater importance. A distinction between current morale and the prospects for long-term satisfaction begins to emerge.

Comparative information about faculty satisfaction with present position, salary, and work environment is presented in Table 5-8. As a group, four out of five educational administration faculty members were quite satisfied with their present positions; less than one out of ten expressed discontent. But women were more than twice as likely as men to be dissatisfied (16% vs. 6%) with their present positions. Minority faculty were less satisfied than their Caucasian peers but not as likely to be dissatisfied as women. Faculty at research universities were less satisfied with their positions than were their counterparts at doctorate-granting or comprehensive institutions. Since professors at research institutions were better paid and better supported in their work (see Chapters 2 and 3), perhaps they had higher expectations for themselves and their institutions. We will return to this point in Chapter 7, when examining the satisfaction of faculty at a select group of programs that enjoy especially strong reputations.

Despite the well-documented decline in the purchasing power of academic salaries over the last 15 years, fewer than one third of the faculty expressed dissatisfaction with their pay, and about half said they were satisfied or very satisfied. Among the women, however, 42% voiced dissatisfaction. Minority professors were neither as satisfied as the mean for all respondents nor as dissatisfied as women.

The vast majority of faculty were pleased with the caliber of their students and colleagues; less than one fifth expressed dissatisfaction. Female faculty and respondents located at research universities were somewhat less satisfied with their students and colleagues. Minority faculty, on the other hand, differed little from the mean for the total 1986 cohort as to satisfaction with the caliber of students and colleagues. While respondents' degree of satisfaction with their departmental structure did not differ by type of institution or UCEA affiliation, female and minority faculty were somewhat less likely to be satisfied with their departmental structure than were their male and Caucasian counterparts.

Some Correlates of Job Satisfaction

The dependent variable, "job satisfaction," was created using responses to the following six satisfaction items: (a) present position, (b) current salary, (c) caliber of graduate students, (d) caliber of departmental colleagues, (e) structure of department, and (f) institutional emphasis on research. The job satisfaction scale was reverse-scored; a low score indicated a high level of satisfaction. In cases where responses were missing, we substituted group means.

Table 5-8 Level of Satisfaction among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents at Research Institutions (N=450)						Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=292)						Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=560)						Male Respondents (N=1,160)						Female Respondents (N=135)					
Satisfaction with:	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response
Present position	40	36	10	10	3	1	42	36	10	6	3	2	43	40	8	5	3	2	43	38	9	6	3	1	31	39	10	16	2	2
Current salary	16	32	25	18	7	1	16	32	20	21	10	2	14	35	20	21	8	2	16	34	22	20	7	1	7	29	19	25	17	2
Caliber of students	11	41	27	17	3	1	12	47	28	9	2	2	10	50	25	11	1	2	11	47	26	12	2	2	7	44	28	16	2	2
Caliber of colleagues	16	30	28	19	6	1	15	42	27	11	3	2	18	37	27	15	3	1	17	37	27	15	4	1	16	27	28	21	7	2
Department structure	13	28	29	18	12	2	14	34	27	14	8	2	18	31	23	18	8	2	16	32	25	17	10	2	15	22	33	22	7	1

Table 5-8 (Continued) Level of Satisfaction among 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Caucasian Respondents (N=1,198)						Minority Respondents (N=86)						Respondents at UCEA Institutions (N=359)						Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions (N=943)						Total Respondents (N=1,302)					
Satisfaction with:	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response
Present position	41	39	9	7	3	2	42	34	9	12	4	—	42	33	11	9	5	1	41	40	8	6	3	2	41	38	9	7	3	2
Current salary	15	34	22	20	8	1	14	28	23	20	14	1	18	30	23	21	6	1	14	35	21	20	9	2	15	33	22	20	8	2
Caliber of students	11	46	27	12	2	2	9	51	20	15	5	—	10	41	30	16	3	1	11	49	25	11	2	2	11	46	26	13	2	2
Caliber of colleagues	17	35	27	15	4	1	9	41	31	16	2	—	19	32	25	18	6	1	16	37	28	15	3	2	17	35	27	15	4	2
Department structure	16	31	25	17	9	2	8	26	30	21	13	2	18	28	26	17	10	1	15	32	26	17	9	2	16	31	26	17	9	2

Through step-wise multiple regression, we determined variables related to satisfaction with the professoriate. Thirteen variables accounted for more than one third of the variance in job satisfaction (Table 5-9). The best predictor of job satisfaction, accounting for 19% of the variance, was disagreement with the suggestion that the poor intellectual climate in one's department is a problem. Phrased positively, when faculty were pleased with their departmental colleagues, they were likely to be satisfied with their careers. The second most potent predictor (accounting for almost 6% of the variance), was academic year salary; the higher the salary, the more likely professors were to be satisfied with their jobs.

Table 5-9 Multiple Regression Analysis of Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction* (N=1,302)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Poor intellectual climate viewed as problem	-.230	-.313	.191	309.14**
Current academic salary	-.072	-.198	.249	100.50**
Politics of academic life viewed as problem	-.096	-.135	.274	45.71**
Low salaries in department viewed as problem	-.088	-.120	.290	29.55**
Lack of able students viewed as problem	-.069	-.088	.302	24.31**
Pressure to publish viewed as problem	-.077	-.113	.309	13.18**
Believe former practitioners make the best professors	.033	.059	.315	12.48**
Present age	-.007	-.085	.318	7.64**
Time spent in university administration	-.003	-.109	.323	9.27**
Academic rank	-.062	-.077	.326	8.10**
Time spent teaching graduate students	-.002	-.073	.329	6.10*
Believe higher standards needed for graduate admissions	-.036	-.059	.331	4.79*
Days per month attending professional meetings	.014	.049	.333	4.64*

* p<.05
** p<.01
*Job satisfaction is composed of six items related to satisfaction in the professorial role.

To examine faculty satisfaction in more detail, we analyzed each of the six items that made up the global "job satisfaction" measure as a dependent variable. The extent to which the departmental intellectual climate was considered to be a problem (6%) was the best predictor of dissatisfaction with present position, followed by the perception that the politics of academic life was a very serious problem (3%). Pressure to publish corresponded with dissatisfaction, too, but accounted for only 1% of the variance (F=27.32, p<.01, not tabled).

Satisfaction with current salary was predicted by eight variables which accounted for 36% of the variance (F=93.52, p<.01, not tabled). Disagreement with the statement that low salaries in the department were a problem accounted for 25% of the variance, and current salary represented 9% of the variance (the higher the salary, the more satisfied). The six remaining variables added only 2% more to the explanation.

Seven variables accounted for 33% of the variance in faculty members' satisfaction with the caliber of their colleagues (F=93.11, p<.01, not tabled). Satisfaction with colleagues was best explained by the extent to which the intellectual climate in the department was considered to be a problem, accounting for 30% of the total variance. The remaining six variables added only about 3% to the regression equation. Apparently, faculty judgments about the quality of intellectual life in their departments are a function of the perceived caliber of colleagues.

Six variables accounted for 31% of the variance in satisfaction with the caliber of graduate students (F=96.51, p<.01, not tabled). Agreement with the statement that the lack of able students was a serious problem accounted for 24% of the variance. That is, those faculty members who did not believe that there was a lack of able graduate students were also more satisfied with students' ability.

Another correlate of satisfaction was whether faculty were likely to leave academe. The best predictor of faculty looking elsewhere for employment (15% of the variance, F=17.23, p<.01, not tabled) was the extent to which they believed quality colleagues were leaving the academy for other positions, followed by current academic year salary (2%) (F=17.23, p<.01, not tabled). An additional indicator of satisfaction was whether faculty would still choose the professorship as a career. This was difficult to predict with the variables from the faculty questionnaire; only 5% of the variance was explained by nine variables (F=8.85, p<.01, not tabled). The extent to which "the politics of academic life" was considered a very serious problem was the best overall predictor, but accounted for only 2% of the variance in whether the respondent would become a professor again.

Satisfaction Among Subgroups

To determine whether the factors related to satisfaction differed among subgroups within the educational administration professoriate, we performed stepwise multiple regressions by gender, race, and UCEA affiliation. We also analyzed satisfaction by length of time in the professoriate (see Chapter 6).

Thirteen variables accounted for about 32% of the variance in job satisfaction for male faculty (Table 5-10). Like other subgroups, the largest single amount of variance for males (19%) was predicted by the extent to which the poor intellectual climate in the department was perceived to be a problem. Other variables contributing two or more percent to the regression explanation were: (a) current academic salary, (b) the perception that politics of academic life were a serious problem, and (c) the perceived lack of able graduate students.

Seven variables comprised the equation which explained 47% of the variance in job satisfaction of women (Table 5-11). Like their male counterparts, women's job satisfaction was best predicted by whether they perceived the intellectual

climate as a problem (27%) and by salary (9%, i.e., the higher the salary the more satisfied). The amount of consulting time was positively related to satisfaction (5%), and the perception that increased off-campus teaching assignments were a problem was negatively related to satisfaction (3%).

Table 5-10 Multiple Regression Analysis of Male Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction[a] (N=1,160)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Poor intellectual climate viewed as problem	-.227	-.307	.188	252.28**
Current academic salary	-.074	-.197	.228	75.85**
Politics of academic life viewed as problem	-.103	-.147	.257	46.26**
Lack of able students viewed as problem	-.070	-.091	.273	25.42**
Pressure for proposals and funding viewed as problem	-.052	-.071	.285	21.66**
Low salary levels in department viewed as problem	-.077	-.106	.292	16.33**
Believe former practitioners make the best professors	.038	.069	.298	7.17*
Time spent in university administration	-.003	-.098	.302	7.03*
Years since granted tenure	-.009	-.072	.306	7.41*
Academic rank	-.065	-.075	.309	6.15*
Pressure to publish viewed as problem	-.053	-.078	.311	4.73*
Believe higher standards needed for graduate admissions	-.037	-.061	.313	4.52*
Time spent teaching graduate students	-.002	-.063	.316	4.55*

* $p<.05$
** $p<.005$
[a]Job satisfaction is composed of six items related to satisfaction in the professorial role.

Three fourths of the 40% of explained variance in job satisfaction for minority faculty could be attributed to the two best predictors for other groups: (a) poor intellectual climate (20%), and (b) salary (9%) ($F=15.21$, $p<.01$, not tabled). More satisfied minority respondents also disagreed that academic standards for admission should be higher (7%) and agreed that quality teaching and research were interdependent (3%).

The top two predictor variables for all minority faculty (intellectual climate and salary) remained the same for male minority faculty, accounting together for 33% of the variance. One additional variable entered the equation for the male minority cohort: more satisfied respondents agreed that there was a lack of able graduate students (5%) ($F=14.07$, $p<.01$, not tabled).

However, the regression equation for minority women was quite different. Three variables accounted for 63% of the variance ($F=11.59$, $p<.01$, not tabled). Dissatisfied minority female respondents perceived the politics of academic life to

be a problem (40%), spent relatively more time in consulting (14%), and served on relatively few doctoral committees (9%). Apparently, minority female faculty derived satisfaction from very different aspects of the professorial role than did their white and minority male counterparts.

Table 5-11 Multiple Regression Analysis of Female Faculty Members' Job Satisfaction[a] (N=135)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Poor intellectual climate viewed as problem	-.349	-.498	.269	50.39**
Current academic salary	-.093	-.224	.359	19.50**
Time spent consulting	.023	.227	.406	11.43**
Increase in off-campus teaching viewed as problem	-.137	-.186	.426	5.31*
Time spent teaching undergraduate students	.008	.164	.446	6.14*
Low salary levels in department viewed as problem	-.119	-.156	.462	4.67*
Number of professional articles published	.009	.131	.475	4.16*

*p<.05
**p<.005
[a]Job satisfaction is composed of six items related to satisfaction in the professorial role.

For most respondents (white males and females and minority males), it was relatively easy to predict satisfaction with salary; those who made more money were more satisfied. Although perceptions of the intellectual climate of the department were related to several of the variables contributing to the job satisfaction measure, these perceptions did not contribute to satisfaction with current salary.

The multiple regression using UCEA affiliation as a dependent variable revealed a similar set of five predictor variables which accounted for about 29% of the variance in respondents' job satisfaction: (a) perception that the poor intellectual climate was a problem (18%), (b) academic year salary (8%); perceived problems related to (c) the best faculty leaving for other positions (1%), (d) the lack of able students (1%), and (e) relatively high number of consulting days per month (.5%) (F=30.04, p<.01, not tabled).

Value Judgments about the Field of Educational Administration

Faculty in 1972 and 1986 were asked to respond on a 5-point scale (from positive to negative) to 19 value statements about educational administration as a field of study, about teaching and research, and about their universities. Table 5-12 compares responses of the two cohorts to estimate the degree to which faculty values have changed. In general, faculty as a group were more likely to disagree with the statements in 1986; on 8 of the 14 statements posed in both studies, a shift toward less agreement was apparent. Those items on which the shift was most striking were:

1. The practice of granting professorial tenure should be abolished in higher education (57% disagreed in 1972, 65% disagreed in 1986).
2. My university needs more explicit tenure and promotion criteria (disagreement rose from 19% to 29%).
3. More of the literature in educational administration should be theory based (disagreement rose from 16% to 28%, and significantly, agreement dropped from 68% to 39%).
4. Former practitioners make the best professors of educational administration (disagreement rose from 24% to 32%).

Table 5-12 Selected Perceptions of 1972 and 1986 Faculty about the Field

	1972 Respondents (N=1,333)						1986 Respondents (N=1,302)					
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Quality teaching and research are interdependent.	31	40	10	15	4	1	35	31	14	13	6	3
More of the educational administration literature should be theory based.	23	45	15	14	2	2	11	28	31	21	7	3
Faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making.	38	44	8	8	1	1	32	35	20	9	2	3
I desire more contact with professors at other universities.	34	46	12	1	1	1	23	44	25	3	2	3
My university needs more explicit tenure and promotion criteria.	29	31	20	15	4	1	18	23	27	19	10	3
Former practitioners make the best educational administration professors.	19	32	24	17	7	1	17	24	25	18	14	3
Scholars with training in related disciplines make the best educational administration professors.	4	20	33	30	12	1	5	16	36	25	15	3
Faculty should be more concerned about well being of own university.	22	52	19	5	1	1	15	40	33	7	2	4
Faculty should participate extensively in scholarly and professional meetings.	37	52	7	3	0	1	27	50	15	4	1	4
I will likely leave academe for other employment.a							6	8	15	19	48	4
Tenure in higher education should be abolished.	7	19	16	32	25	1	8	10	14	22	43	4
Excellence in teaching and research are seldom exhibited by same individual.	5	22	16	39	17	1	8	20	17	27	26	3
Faculty should have fewer committee and administrative assignments.	11	37	24	25	2	1	13	30	34	17	3	3
Academic standards for student admission to graduate programs should be higher.	12	29	20	32	6	1	11	29	25	23	9	3
Academic standards for awarding doctoral degrees should be higher.	11	24	25	23	5	12	9	24	22	16	8	3
Increased emphasis on the general practice of administration would enhance field.a							15	42	30	6	3	5
Greater attention should be given to field studies.*							16	49	22	8	1	4
Students should be required to complete a residency requirement to earn a doctorate.*							31	27	16	11	8	7
Increased emphasis on qualitative research methods would strengthen inquiry in educational administration.*							17	41	24	11	3	3

*These items were not listed on the 1972 survey.

In a time of fiscal austerity, one might expect faculty to reaffirm the principle of tenure and to voice concern that tenure decisions not become mired in procedural detail, but the 1986 respondents voiced less concern than did the 1972 cohort about the need for explicit tenure and promotion criteria. This decline might be explained by the greater number of tenured faculty at the rank of professor in 1986; these faculty may be less concerned about the review process since it no longer affects them. The rising interest in field studies and growing awareness of the limits of theory (or belief that the literature was sufficiently anchored in theory to warrant increased attention to other priorities) came across clearly in the third item above. Without doubt, this shift was one of the most notable to occur between 1972 and 1986. But the fourth item, which reveals less concern that faculty have administrative experience in their backgrounds, is harder to interpret. The shift is rather small, but it may reflect a fine but important distinction between studying the field at close range and being so closely tied to it that objectivity is lost.

Another significant change between 1972 and 1986 was the *drop* in agreement (from 74% to 55%) with the statement that faculty should be more concerned about the well-being of their own university. When this information is coupled with the decline in agreement that faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making (from 82% to 67%), it appears that the "habits of professors' hearts" paralleled the rise in private interest at the expense of the collective welfare that has been noted throughout society in the 1970s and early 1980s (Bellah et al., 1985). On the other hand, faculty voiced less agreement in 1986 than in 1972 with a statement proposing fewer committee and administrative assignments. However, this finding could mean that faculty actually had fewer committee assignments in 1986.

The difficulty in interpreting responses to value statements is illustrated by the decline in agreement that respondents would like more contact with professors at other universities (from 80% in 1972 to 67% in 1986). This shift may suggest that in fact faculty have experienced increased opportunities for contacts with peers at other universities, and thus they did not feel a need for "more" outside contacts. But it also could indicate that faculty were turning inward by 1986 and did not care as much about interacting with colleagues elsewhere.

Five of the value-judgment questions were asked for the first time in 1986. Only 6% of the faculty believed that it was *likely* that they would leave academe for other employment, and only 14% believed there was some possibility of this occurrence in their career. Nearly 70% disagreed that they would ever leave academe, and about half disagreed strongly. Even so, this finding may reveal less about faculty desires than it does about their sense of reality—particularly since the average age of educational administration faculty now exceeds 50 years.

The responses to the value statements with respondents grouped by gender, race, type of institution, and UCEA affiliation are provided in Table 5-13. Faculty at research institutions were more likely to believe that quality teaching and research are interdependent, that the literature of the field should be theory based, and that academic standards for awarding of doctoral degrees should be higher. Women faculty were more inclined than men to believe strongly that the literature should be

theory based, to desire more extensive contact with faculty at other universities, to consider a career move outside academe, and to advocate more attention to field studies and qualitative research methods. They were less likely to believe that former practitioners make the best professors of educational administration. Professors from minority groups were more interested in explicit tenure and promotion criteria, and somewhat less likely to believe that former practitioners make the best professors. They were correspondingly more inclined to believe that scholars with training in related disciplines make the best professors.

Despite the minor differences noted above, the most striking observation that arises from examining the subgroups' responses to the value judgments is how little faculty differed according to the kinds of universities where employed or their ethnicity or gender. Significant differences among these groups were conspicuous by their absence.

Changes in Scholarly Orientation and Program Emphases

Educational administration faculty in 1986 believed that some changes were warranted in the nature of their scholarship. Sixty-five percent of the faculty believed that the practice of administration could be improved if more attention were directed toward field studies. Further, interest in qualitative research methods may now be considered something of an enthusiasm; nearly 60% of the faculty believed that more qualitative research would strengthen inquiry in educational administration, while only 14% disagreed with this notion. These findings document the widely discussed trend toward embracing alternative approaches to examining problems and issues in the field.

We also gathered data on faculty sentiments about the relative importance of qualitative and quantitative research in educational administration through questions pertaining to respondents' current and preferred departmental emphases on research (Table 5-14). When asked about the *current* research emphasis in their department, 16% believed that qualitative approaches were emphasized, and 27% indicated there was more emphasis on quantitative approaches. Twenty-eight percent said that an equal balance prevailed, and 21% said research was not emphasized in their departments.

A companion question asked faculty how their departments *should* address research; qualitative approaches rose from 16% to 21%, and quantitative approaches dropped from 27% to 7%. The proportion of faculty who believed a balance should prevail (52%) was considerably higher than the 28% who perceived that such a balance already existed in their programs. As a group, women were more inclined than men to favor a balance between the two inquiry approaches (63% to 51%). Faculty at research universities believed their current programs were much more dependent on quantitative methods, but their *preferred* emphasis was strikingly less quantitative. No matter how the data are analyzed, a major shift in research approaches is taking place among professors of educational administration.

Table 5-13 Selected Perceptions about the Field for 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents at Research Institutions (N=450)						Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=292)						Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=560)					
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Quality teaching and research are interdependent.	44	30	10	10	4	2	33	32	13	11	9	3	28	30	17	16	6	3
More of the educational administration literature should be theory based.	17	31	31	14	4	2	12	23	35	21	7	3	6	28	29	26	10	3
Faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making.	31	36	21	9	1	2	31	35	19	10	2	2	33	35	19	8	3	3
I desire more contact with professors at other universities.	18	43	31	4	1	3	25	42	22	5	2	3	26	45	23	2	1	3
My university needs more explicit tenure and promotion criteria.	18	19	29	22	9	3	19	22	27	20	10	2	17	27	26	17	10	4
Former practitioners make the best educational administration professors.	7	17	28	26	20	3	19	27	22	14	14	3	25	27	24	13	8	3
Scholars with training in related disciplines make the best educational administration professors.	7	20	37	22	9	4	4	15	31	24	20	3	4	13	37	26	17	3
Faculty should be more concerned about well being of own university.	10	41	37	6	2	4	14	39	33	7	2	5	18	40	30	8	2	3
Faculty should participate extensively in scholarly and professional meetings.	27	51	13	3	2	4	26	47	17	5	1	4	26	51	15	4	1	3
I will likely leave academe for other employment.	4	8	14	23	46	4	8	8	16	16	49	3	7	8	15	17	49	4
Tenure in higher education should be abolished.	7	10	12	24	43	4	9	13	12	21	43	2	8	9	17	21	42	4
Excellence in teaching and research are seldom exhibited by the same person.	4	15	14	29	34	3	11	21	15	26	25	3	10	23	20	26	19	3
Faculty should have fewer committee and administrative assignments.	9	28	39	18	3	3	15	35	30	12	5	3	15	29	32	18	3	3
Academic standards for student admission to graduate programs should be higher.	10	30	28	21	8	3	11	24	20	29	14	3	11	30	24	23	8	4
Academic standards for awarding doctoral degrees should be higher.	11	36	24	18	7	4	13	26	18	25	13	5	6	12	22	8	5	47
Increased emphasis on the general practice of administration would enhance field.	10	37	36	8	4	5	18	41	27	7	2	5	18	46	27	3	2	4
Greater attention to field studies would strengthen practice.	18	46	23	9	1	3	15	44	25	12	1	3	16	53	20	5	2	4
Students should be required to complete a residency requirement.	30	36	13	10	7	4	35	26	18	11	8	3	31	20	16	11	8	14
Increased emphasis on qualitative research methods would strengthen inquiry.	18	40	26	9	2	3	20	43	18	11	4	4	14	40	26	13	4	3

Table 5-13 (Continued) Selected Perceptions about the Field for 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Male Respondents (N=1,160)						Female Respondents (N=135)						Caucasian Respondents (N=1,198)					
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Quality teaching and research are interdependent.	35	31	14	12	6	2	38	29	13	16	2	3	35	31	14	13	6	2
More of the educational administration literature should be theory based.	10	28	31	22	8	2	18	30	33	13	3	3	11	28	31	21	7	2
Faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making.	32	35	20	9	2	2	32	36	21	7	2	4	31	36	19	9	2	2
I desire more contact with professors at other universities.	22	45	26	3	2	3	38	36	19	3	2	4	23	44	25	4	2	3
My university needs more explicit tenure and promotion criteria.	17	23	27	20	10	3	23	23	27	14	9	4	17	23	27	20	10	3
Former practitioners make the best educational administration professors.	18	24	25	17	13	3	16	22	25	20	16	2	18	24	25	17	13	3
Scholars with training in related disciplines make the best educational administration professors.	5	16	35	26	16	3	7	16	45	19	10	3	5	16	36	25	15	3
Faculty should be more concerned about well being of own university.	15	41	32	6	2	3	13	31	39	12	2	4	14	41	33	7	2	3
Faculty should participate extensively in scholarly and professional meetings.	26	51	15	4	1	3	36	43	15	4	—	3	27	50	15	4	1	3
I will likely leave academe for other employment.	6	8	15	18	50	4	10	13	18	22	33	4	6	8	14	18	50	4
Tenure in higher education should be abolished.	8	11	13	22	44	3	7	8	34	22	36	4	7	11	14	22	43	3
Excellence in teaching and research are seldom exhibited by the same person.	8	20	16	27	26	3	12	14	20	26	26	2	9	20	16	27	26	3
Faculty should have fewer committee and administrative assignments.	13	30	34	17	4	3	16	28	30	19	2	4	13	30	34	17	3	3
Academic standards for student admission to graduate programs should be higher.	11	29	24	24	10	3	13	31	25	20	8	3	11	30	24	23	9	3
Academic standards for awarding doctoral degrees should be higher.	9	24	22	16	8	22	13	22	21	14	7	24	9	24	21	15	8	23
Increased emphasis on the general practice of administration would enhance field.	15	42	30	6	3	4	19	38	30	8	2	4	15	42	30	6	3	4
Greater attention to field studies would strengthen practice.	16	50	22	8	1	3	22	40	26	6	3	4	16	49	23	8	1	3
Students should be required to complete a residency requirement.	32	27	16	11	8	7	29	30	16	9	5	11	32	27	16	11	8	7
Increased emphasis on qualitative research methods would strengthen inquiry.	16	41	25	12	3	3	24	42	22	8	2	3	17	41	25	11	3	3

Table 5-13 (Continued) Selected Perceptions about the Field for 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Minority Respondents (N=86)						Respondents at UCEA Institutions (N=359)						Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions (N=943)					
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Neither	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	No response
Quality teaching and research are interdependent.	37	28	14	8	11	2	46	29	9	9	5	3	30	31	16	14	6	3
More of the educational administration literature should be theory based.	15	30	27	17	8	2	16	32	32	15	4	2	9	26	31	23	8	3
Faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making.	37	34	22	2	1	4	32	32	22	10	1	3	32	37	19	8	2	3
I desire more contact with professors at other universities.	24	43	29	—	1	2	20	41	32	5	2	3	25	45	23	3	1	3
My university needs more explicit tenure and promotion criteria.	29	24	29	9	5	4	15	18	28	25	12	3	19	25	27	17	9	3
Former practitioners make the best educational administration professors.	16	17	23	21	19	4	7	14	27	27	23	3	21	28	24	14	10	3
Scholars with training in related disciplines make the best educational administration professors.	13	16	30	23	13	5	7	21	38	21	10	4	5	14	35	27	17	3
Faculty should be more concerned about well being of own university.	21	33	35	6	2	4	10	40	38	7	2	3	16	40	31	7	2	4
Faculty should participate extensively in scholarly and professional meetings.	26	49	16	5	1	4	30	49	15	3	1	3	25	51	15	5	1	4
I will likely leave academe for other employment.	9	13	23	21	29	5	4	6	13	25	48	3	7	9	16	17	48	4
Tenure in higher education should be abolished.	12	7	20	17	40	5	6	11	12	23	44	3	8	10	15	21	21	4
Excellence in teaching and research are seldom exhibited by the same person.	5	15	27	26	26	2	6	13	14	30	35	3	9	22	18	26	22	3
Faculty should have fewer committee and administrative assignments.	13	31	40	8	5	4	10	28	37	18	4	3	14	30	33	17	3	3
Academic standards for student admission to graduate programs should be higher.	14	17	26	28	12	4	10	33	27	18	9	3	11	27	24	26	9	3
Academic standards for awarding doctoral degrees should be higher.	12	17	26	21	8	16	14	35	23	15	8	5	7	19	21	16	8	29
Increased emphasis on the general practice of administration would enhance field.	17	42	29	7	1	4	11	35	37	9	4	6	17	44	27	5	2	4
Greater attention to field studies would strengthen practice.	20	43	22	6	2	5	15	44	25	12	1	3	17	50	21	6	2	4
Students should be required to complete a residency requirement.	31	23	16	12	8	9	33	35	15	8	6	4	31	23	16	12	8	9
Increased emphasis on qualitative research methods would strengthen inquiry.	14	43	24	13	2	4	16	44	25	10	1	3	17	40	24	12	4	3

Table 5-14 Current and Preferred Departmental Emphasis on Research with 1986 Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Current research emphasis in own department																				
Qualitative approaches emphasized	68	15	60	21	78	14	183	16	23	17	188	16	17	20	56	16	150	16	206	16
Quantitative approaches emphasized	169	38	100	34	87	16	314	27	41	30	333	28	20	23	126	35	230	24	356	27
Qualitative and quantitative equally emphasized	154	34	75	26	136	24	335	29	30	22	337	28	23	27	122	34	243	26	365	28
Research not emphasized	32	7	32	11	206	37	235	20	32	24	250	21	15	17	29	8	241	26	270	21
No response	27	6	25	9	53	10	93	8	9	7	90	8	11	13	26	7	79	8	105	8
Preferred research emphasis in own department																				
Qualitative approaches emphasized	91	20	73	25	113	20	257	22	19	14	259	22	14	16	69	19	208	22	277	21
Quantitative approaches emphasized	27	6	27	9	31	6	76	7	8	6	80	7	4	5	27	8	58	6	85	7
Qualitative and quantitative equally emphasized	280	62	152	52	241	43	587	51	85	63	623	53	43	50	226	63	447	47	673	52
Research not emphasized	9	2	8	3	76	14	87	8	5	4	90	8	3	4	4	1	89	9	93	7
No response	43	10	32	11	99	18	153	13	18	13	146	12	22	26	33	9	141	15	174	13

Table 5-15 Current and Preferred Orientation of Own Graduate Program with Respondents Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Current orientation																				
Preparing practitioners	306	68	231	79	482	86	902	78	113	84	942	79	65	76	244	68	775	82	1,019	78
Preparing professors and researchers	43	10	18	6	11	2	70	6	2	2	68	6	3	4	25	7	47	5	72	6
Equally balanced between the two	86	19	27	9	32	6	129	11	15	11	133	11	10	12	74	21	71	8	145	11
No response	15	3	16	6	35	6	59	5	5	4	55	5	8	9	16	5	50	5	66	5
Preferred orientation																				
Preparing practitioners	144	32	151	52	352	63	598	52	46	34	612	51	28	33	102	28	545	58	647	50
Preparing professors and researchers	54	12	11	4	17	3	73	6	8	6	74	6	5	6	43	12	39	4	82	6
Equally balanced between the two	212	47	104	36	110	20	361	31	64	47	392	33	30	35	185	52	241	26	426	33
No response	40	9	26	9	81	15	128	11	17	13	120	10	23	27	29	8	118	13	147	11

Should educational administration graduate programs be designed primarily to prepare future administrators or future researchers/professors? Considering educational administration faculty as a whole, 50% believed graduate programs should be designed primarily to prepare practitioners; only 6% viewed preparing professors and researchers as the chief priority (Table 5-15). But one third of the respondents would balance these two purposes equally (see Appendix H for discriminant analysis data comparing respondents by their preferred program orientation). Fewer than one third of the faculty at UCEA-member institutions believed that preparing practitioners should receive the main emphasis, and over half favored a balance between preparing practitioners and professors/researchers. Consistent with the greater scholarly orientation that they exhibited throughout the 1986 study, women placed more emphasis on preparing professors/researchers than did men. This matter of program emphasis, especially at research universities, has particular importance since a turnover of at least 50% among educational administration faculty will occur in the next decade and a half.

Program Priorities and Quality

Faculty were asked to rank-order a list of critical needs facing the academic field of educational administration (Table 5-16). Virtually no consensus existed in 1986 regarding where effort should be invested to improve the profession. Compared with the 1972 study, the number of faculty who believed that extending the knowledge base was an important priority decreased. Clearly, faculty members are moving their attention from knowledge expansion to a broader range of concerns.

Table 5-16 1972 and 1986 Respondents' Perceptions of the Most Critical Needs Facing the Field

	First Most Critical Need				Second Most Critical Need				Third Most Critical Need			
	1972		1986		1972		1986		1972		1986	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
More able students	143	11	188	14	197	15	116	9	305	23	123	9
More extensive knowledge base	443	33	170	13	357	27	167	13	279	21	161	12
More attention to practical problems	271	20	151	12	304	23	147	11	280	21	125	10
Curriculum reform	394	30	209	16	399	30	164	13	298	22	159	12
More emphasis on research*			64	5			93	7			92	7
Faculty with expertise in other fields*			58	5			92	7			96	7
External support for research*			143	11			142	11			128	10
Closer ties with practitioners*			150	12			207	16			192	14
Other	58	4	43	3	39	3	12	1	87	7	26	2
No response	24	2	126	10	37	3	162	12	84	6	200	15

*These items were not listed on the 1972 survey.

Table 5-17 presents the responses of subgroups to the "critical needs" question. The more research-oriented the university, the less likely its faculty members were concerned about practical problems in the field or developing closer ties with practitioners. Faculty at research institutions were more concerned about the need to secure external support for their scholarship.

Women faculty were less concerned than men about the need to recruit more able students and the need to direct more attention to practical problems. At the same time, female professors ranked the need for curriculum reform and for external research support higher than did their male counterparts. Like women, minority faculty were less concerned about the need to recruit more able students, but they did not differ from the norm regarding attention to practical problems. Curriculum reform was a matter of greater urgency for faculty from minority groups than it was for their Caucasian colleagues.

What content areas do faculty believe should receive greater emphasis in teaching and research? Although leadership topped the list (Table 5-18), only 9% ranked it first. There appeared to be little if any agreement about which topics should receive more attention, and the fact that most faculty did not respond to this question is a message in itself.

When asked to rate the quality of the graduate educational administration program at their own institution, more than one fourth of the faculty believed that their program was "excellent" and more than half believed that it was "good" (Table 5-19). This comes as no surprise. A companion question asked respondents to rate the quality of their educational administration preparation program compared with 10 years ago. Over 30% believed their programs were much better; another 30% believed they were somewhat better; and 18% believed them to be about the same quality as before. Only 11% regarded their program as worse than it had been a decade earlier. About 9% (and one fourth of the women) offered no response, primarily because they had not been at their institutions 10 years earlier.

Summary

Educational administration faculty members in 1986 were generally contented with their chosen career but somewhat discontented with the conditions of their employment. Perhaps this overall satisfaction with career choice helps explain why the 1986 cohort, like the 1972 group, remained complacent about their problems and issues in the field. While faculty responses to value statements about the field were generally similar in 1972 and 1986, there were a few noteworthy changes. Between the two studies, there was a rise in commitment to field work and qualitative research. Also evident was a declining faith in theory and empirical research as near-exclusive sources of knowledge in our field.

Although female faculty were generally satisfied with their roles, certain conditions of employment (e.g., salary, quality of colleagues) troubled women more than men. Indeed, as a subgroup within the educational administration professoriate, women were divergent—more committed to research and more critical of the status quo—perhaps in part because women are younger and more

Table 5-17 First Most Critical Need Facing the Field Reported by 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions		Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions		Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions		Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Caucasian Respondents		Minority Respondents		Respondents at UCEA Institutions		Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions		Total Respondents	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
More able students	71	16	35	12	82	15	177	15	10	7	177	15	8	9	57	16	131	14	188	14
More extensive knowledge base	69	15	40	14	61	11	151	13	18	13	159	13	9	11	60	17	110	12	170	13
More attention to practical problems	35	8	34	12	82	15	143	12	8	6	138	12	10	12	28	8	123	13	151	12
Curriculum reform	64	14	49	17	96	17	182	16	27	20	192	16	17	20	51	14	158	17	209	16
More emphasis on research	29	6	15	5	20	4	53	5	10	7	59	5	3	4	28	8	36	4	64	5
Faculty with expertise in other fields	30	7	11	4	17	3	52	5	6	4	52	4	6	7	20	6	38	4	58	5
External support for research	68	15	31	11	44	8	123	11	20	15	132	11	11	13	55	15	88	9	143	11
Closer ties with practitioners	22	5	42	14	86	15	136	12	14	10	138	12	10	12	21	6	129	14	150	12
Other	16	4	7	2	20	4	39	3	3	2	42	4	1	1	6	2	37	4	43	3
No response	46	10	28	10	52	9	104	9	19	14	109	9	11	13	33	9	93	10	126	10
Total	450	100	292	100	560	100	1,160	100	135	100	1,198	100	86	100	359	100	943	100	1,302*	100

*The "total" includes 7 respondents who did not indicate their gender and 18 who did not indicate their race.

recently appointed than their male counterparts. Whatever the reasons, women faculty and, to some extent, minority faculty seem to value different things and, therefore, bring fresh perspectives to the professoriate. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, faculty appointed within the last five years also bring to their roles some values that differ from those of their more senior colleagues.

Table 5-18 1986 Respondents' Perceptions of Topics That Should Receive Additional Emphasis in Teaching or Research

	Most Pressing Need		Second Most Pressing Need	
	N	%	N	%
Leadership	119	9	46	4
Organizational theory	75	6	30	2
Finance	46	4	23	2
Political and social issues	36	3	40	3
Legal concerns	34	3	38	3
Policy development	35	3	26	2
Personnel management	26	2	18	1
Curriculum	27	2	19	2
Interpersonal relations	23	2	14	1
Administrator effectiveness	21	2	10	1
Minority representation	28	2	—	—
Administrative inservice	21	2	—	—
Planning	20	2	22	2

The attitudes and values of educational administration faculty are better understood when contrasted with faculty in other disciplines; thus, brief mention of a few related studies is warranted. Ladd and Lipset produced their landmark work, *The Divided Academy*, in 1975. While not addressing educational administration as a subfield, they provided information on the values and beliefs of education professors as well as faculty in other fields. Education faculty tended to be older when they were first appointed to professorial roles and older than faculty in other disciplines. Education faculty in 1975 also exhibited a relatively low level of commitment to research and scholarship. The proportion of education faculty members strongly satisfied with their career choice was slightly higher than the average for faculty across disciplines. The professorial groups with which education professors compared most closely were two other applied academic fields, agriculture and business.

Table 3-19 Perceptions of Program Quality with 1986 Faculty Grouped by Type of Institution, Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents at Research Institutions (N=450) N	%	Respondents at Doctorate-Granting Institutions (N=292) N	%	Respondents at Comprehensive Institutions (N=560) N	%	Male Respondents (N=1160) N	%	Female Respondents (N=135) N	%	Caucasian Respondents (N=1198) N	%	Minority Respondents (N=86) N	%	Respondents at UCEA Institutions (N=359) N	%	Respondents at Non-UCEA Institutions (N=943) N	%	Total Respondents (N=1302) N	%
Perceived quality of educational administration program at own institution																				
Excellent	129	29	77	26	155	28	334	29	27	20	344	29	15	17	112	31	249	26	361	28
Good	218	48	157	54	301	54	603	52	69	51	617	52	50	58	163	45	513	54	676	52
Fair	75	17	45	15	84	15	171	15	32	24	184	15	16	19	58	16	146	16	204	16
Poor	15	3	4	1	8	1	23	2	4	3	23	2	4	5	12	3	15	2	27	2
No response	13	3	9	3	12	2	29	3	3	2	30	3	1	1	14	4	20	2	34	3
Educational administration program compared to 10 years ago																				
Much better	109	24	104	36	193	35	365	32	41	30	371	31	30	35	83	23	323	34	406	31
Somewhat better	114	25	96	33	186	33	358	31	36	27	371	31	21	24	112	31	284	30	396	30
About the same	100	22	46	16	91	16	219	19	17	13	219	18	15	17	78	22	159	17	237	18
Worse	71	16	25	9	38	7	126	11	7	5	123	10	8	9	48	13	88	9	134	10
Much worse	9	2	3	1	3	1	15	1	—	—	13	1	2	2	4	1	11	1	15	1
No response	47	10	18	6	49	9	77	7	34	25	101	8	10	12	36	10	78	8	114	9

Bowen and Schuster (1986, p. 47), citing the earlier Bayer (1973) survey, concluded that career satisfaction among professors in general has run about 86%. Other studies have suggested a range from 82% to 90% (Carnegie Foundation, 1977; Ladd & Lipset, 1975). Our findings viewed in the context of these earlier studies place educational administration faculty squarely in the expected range. The seemingly high satisfaction with career choice has been, in fact, quite typical of all professors in recent years. Finkelstein (1984, p. 79) aggregated similar figures for the academic profession, suggesting that between 83% and 88% of faculty members were satisfied with their careers.

Finkelstein (1984), however, concluded that satisfaction with career choice does *not* necessarily imply satisfaction with one's present situation (high morale). For example, he claimed that the nature of academic work meets human needs better than most careers do today because the work of college teachers and scholars is intrinsically interesting, socially useful, and generally autonomous. For most college faculty, teaching is an inherently rewarding activity; professors enjoy being trusted to act on their own judgments about what they should teach and how, and they tend to be verbal people who enjoy working with ideas. He noted, however, that working conditions can cause fluctuations in day-to-day satisfaction or morale.

Finkelstein (1984) drew on several studies in concluding that the degree of *control* faculty have over their own work usually relates directly to satisfaction. Career stress arises not so much from work load or even from the tensions inherent in the issues addressed by faculty as from a feeling that faculty members have little control over their own professional affairs. It is quite natural then, that women and minority faculty, who are less likely to be tenured, are less satisfied with their career choice. It is also clear that increased administrative authority and declining faculty involvement in university governance, mounting legislative and system-wide regulations, and at least some aspects of performance assessment, endanger the intrinsic satisfactions that faculty members glean from their work. These forces certainly sap faculty morale, and they may already be claiming an increasing toll on satisfaction with the profession and choice of an academic career.

If educational administration faculty are indeed the wellspring of the profession, formally educating all who enter it, then the professorship must be sufficiently appealing to attract and keep the ablest minds available. The findings reported in this chapter, considered in light of recent studies of academic life more generally, suggest that career satisfactions are declining while agreement about perceived problems is still lacking. One finds little comfort in these conclusions.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 6 ❖❖❖

NEW PROFESSORS: CHARACTERISTICS, ACTIVITIES, AND BELIEFS

Given an aging professoriate, departments of educational administration can expect substantial turnover within the next decade. Because "the excellence of higher education is a function of the kind of people it is able to enlist and retain on its faculties" (Bowen & Schuster, 1986, p. 3), the quality of preparation programs into the next century will depend to a large extent on those who will replace about half of the current faculty cohort by the year 2000. One strategy for anticipating the future is to look backwards (Neustadt & May, 1986). As the activities and attitudes of the 1972 and 1986 faculty cohorts are similar in many ways, the characteristics of the next generation of educational administration faculty will probably reflect, to a considerable degree, those of recently appointed faculty.

This chapter contrasts the personal characteristics, professional activities, and beliefs of educational administration faculty who have been professors for 5 years or less with characteristics of their more experienced colleagues. For the purposes of this discussion, faculty members with 5 or fewer years of professorial experience are referred to as "new faculty" even though many have more than a few years of postdoctoral experience in administration.

An obvious change in the educational administration professoriate has been the increasing number of women hired in the past decade. Gender has been linked to differences in management styles, relationships with students, climate of the work environment, and decision making (Shakeshaft, 1987). Because the influx of female faculty promises to make a qualitative difference in preparation programs, this analysis gives particular attention to gender differences.

Personal and Professional Characteristics

Of the 1,302 educational administration faculty represented in this study, 14% (n=177) assumed their professorial roles within the preceding five-year period. Fifty of the new faculty were from UCEA-member institutions (28%), comparable to the portion of total respondents from UCEA institutions. Based on the Carnegie (1987) classification of institutions of higher education, the percentage of new faculty employed at research institutions (34%, n=60) was also comparable to the portion of all respondents at research institutions (35%). However, only 18 (10%) of the new faculty were employed at doctorate-granting institutions (compared to 22% of all respondents), and over half (56%, n=99) of the new faculty were employed at comprehensive universities (compared to 43% of all respondents). The majority of new faculty in educational administration were not employed at institutions with an emphasis on research or doctoral education.[1]

Fifty-one of the new faculty (29%) were women and accounted for almost two fifths of all women in the 1986 faculty cohort. In contrast, the 126 males among the new faculty represented only 11% of the total 1986 male cohort. Female representation among new faculty was slightly higher at UCEA institutions (32% compared to 28% at non-UCEA institutions, Table 6-1).

Table 6-1 New and Experienced Faculty Members in 1986 by Gender, Race, and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate						Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate					
	UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	34	68	92	72	126	71	289	94	745	91	1,034	92
Female	16	32	35	28	51	29	18	6	66	8	84	8
Minority	6	12	10	8	16	9	10	3	60	7	70	6
Caucasian	44	88	117	92	161	91	292	95	745	91	1,037	92
Total†	50	100	127	100	177	100	309	100	816	100	1,125	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
†Seven experienced respondents did not indicate their gender, and 18 did not indicate their race.

About one fifth (19%) of the 86 minority respondents were appointed to their first professorial position within the preceding 5-year period. Yet, unlike women, minorities were not disproportionately represented within the new faculty group. Nine percent of the new faculty were minorities, only slightly higher than the percentage of minorities in the entire 1986 cohort (7%). However, minority representation among new hires at UCEA institutions exceeded the mean, 12% compared to 8% at non-UCEA institutions (Table 6-1). Because of the small number of minority respondents who had been hired within the past 5 years (n=16), comparisons by race are not made in this chapter.

It was expected that the distribution across academic ranks would differ significantly between new faculty members and their more experienced colleagues. While 67% of the faculty with more than 5 years of professorial experience held the rank of professor, about 12% of the new faculty held this rank (Table 6-2). However, within the new faculty group, almost four times as many men (15%) as women (4%) held the rank of professor. Women comprised 35% of the newly hired assistant professors and 30% of the associate professors (not tabled).

Age and professional experience may provide partial explanations for the gender differences in academic rank. Within the new faculty group, women and men received the doctorate at about the same age (35, not tabled), but men in the new faculty cohort on the average were about 6 years older than women (46 compared to 40, Table 6-3). Thirty-seven percent of the men and only 10% of the women were over 50 years of age. In this sense, age may serve as a surrogate for experience. Men with experience in the superintendency, for example, would be more likely to be appointed at the rank of professor.

It was somewhat surprising to find significant rank and age differences within the new faculty group based on UCEA affiliation. Almost three fourths (72%) of the new faculty at UCEA-member institutions were assistant professors, whereas fewer than half (46%) of the new faculty at non-UCEA institutions held this rank (see Table 6-2). New faculty at non-UCEA institutions were about twice as likely to be associate or full professors.

Consistent with the rank differences, faculty at UCEA-member institutions on the average were 5 years younger than their non-UCEA peers (41 compared to 46, see Table 6-3). For new faculty in UCEA-member programs, the mean age for receiving the doctorate was 34 and for entering the professoriate was 38 (not tabled). In contrast, non-UCEA respondents as a group earned the doctorate at age 36 and entered the professoriate at age 43. UCEA-member institutions are apparently more likely to hire young junior faculty and, as discussed later, are more concerned about their orientation toward research than their length of administrative experience.

The vast majority of new faculty (87%) had not acquired tenure, which is not surprising since 6 years is a typical probationary period before tenure is awarded. The gender discrepancy in rank among new faculty did not hold for tenure status. While men were more likely to be tenured, the difference was not large; 14% of the men compared with 12% of the women had acquired tenure (not tabled). Differences in tenure status were also insignificant when comparing new faculty by UCEA affiliation.

Table 6-2 Rank of New and Experienced Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate									
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total		Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor	19	15	2	4	3	6	18	14	21	12	717	69	31	37	215	70	537	66	752	67
Associate professor	38	30	16	31	9	18	45	35	54	31	268	26	30	36	83	27	216	27	299	27
Assistant professor	61	48	33	65	36	72	58	46	94	53	25	2	15	18	7	2	34	4	41	4
Other	7	6	—	—	2	4	5	4	7	4	7	1	8	10	4	1	28	4	32	3
No response	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	17	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,034	100	84	100	309	100	816	100	1,125*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes seven experienced respondents who did not indicate their gender.

Table 6-3 Age of New and Experienced Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate									
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total		Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20-29	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	2	—
30-39	38	30	26	51	27	54	37	29	64	36	28	3	13	16	12	4	29	3	41	4
40-49	41	33	20	39	17	34	44	35	61	35	253	25	29	35	91	29	191	23	282	25
50-59	36	29	5	10	4	8	37	29	41	23	522	50	28	34	132	43	418	51	550	47
60-69	9	7	—	—	2	4	7	6	9	5	197	19	4	5	58	19	144	18	202	18
70 and over	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	1	8	1	—	—	2	1	6	1	8	1
No response	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25	2	10	12	13	4	27	3	40	4
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,034	100	84	100	309	100	816	100	1,125*	100
Mean	46.1		40.4		40.9		45.9		44.5		53.7		47.4		52.8		53.4		53.3	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes seven experienced respondents who did not indicate their gender.

New faculty were more likely than experienced faculty to have assumed their current roles directly from an administrative position in public schools. Of the 137 new faculty responding to this item, over two fifths had been either superintendents (22%) or other public school administrators (20%) in their most recent positions (not tabled). Thirty percent had occupied either teaching (18%) or administrative (12%) roles in higher education prior to assuming their current faculty positions. In contrast, only 23% of the total 1986 respondents had occupied public school administrative roles and 58% had been employed in higher education immediately prior to assuming their current jobs (see Chapter 3, Table 3-25).

The employment backgrounds of new faculty differed by gender and UCEA affiliation. Over two fifths (41%) of the female new faculty compared with 35% of the males had occupied positions in higher education prior to their current jobs. Male new faculty (48%) were far more likely than females (28%) to have held public school administrative roles in their most recent positions. New faculty at UCEA-member institutions were less likely than their non-UCEA counterparts to have occupied a public school administrative role (33% vs. 45%) and were more likely to have been employed in higher education (34% vs. 28%) immediately prior to assuming their current positions (not tabled).

The 171 new faculty who indicated where they received their doctorates named 90 different institutions. Eighteen institutions produced three or more new faculty and accounted for 47% of the new faculty cohort (Table 6-4). All of these 18 institutions are research institutions according to the Carnegie (1987) classification scheme. Stanford University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison accounted for the most new faculty (7 each). Four of the 18 top producers of new faculty (UCLA, University of Southern Mississippi, SUNY-Buffalo, and University of Washington) were not among the top 34 producers of the total 1986 faculty cohort (see Chapter 3, Table 3-23).

Comparison of New and Experienced Faculty Members' Activities and Attitudes

To determine if recently appointed faculty differed from their more experienced colleagues in activities and beliefs, we performed a discriminant analysis. Fifteen variables differentiated the two groups, and an excellent model was derived as 89% of the cases were correctly classified (Table 6-5). Only 2% of the new faculty were not correctly classified in their group, indicating that the model accurately described almost all of the new faculty cohort. Positive coefficients reflect characteristics typical of experienced faculty; negative coefficients represent new faculty.

Faculty with more experience: (a) tended to spend more time supervising doctoral work, (b) were slightly less satisfied with the emphasis placed on research in their department, (c) did not believe higher standards for student admission were needed, (d) disagreed that the best faculty were leaving the academy, and (e) reported more income from external sources such as royalties, lectures, and consulting.

Table 6-4 Institutions from Which New Faculty[a] Received the Doctorate

Institution	# of Faculty[b]	% of Total[c]
Stanford University	7	4.1
University of Wisconsin-Madison	7	4.1
Columbia University	6	3.5
UCLA	5	2.9
University of Chicago	5	2.9
University of Georgia	5	2.9
The Ohio State University	5	2.9
Vanderbilt University	5	2.9
University of Florida	4	2.4
University of Iowa	4	2.4
University of Michigan	4	2.4
University of Southern Mississippi	4	2.4
Florida State University	3	1.8
Indiana University	3	1.8
Michigan State University	3	1.8
University of Nebraska	3	1.8
SUNY-Buffalo	3	1.8
University of Washington	3	1.8

[a]New faculty are those within 5 years of their initial professorial appointment.
[b]Only institutions that awarded doctoral degrees to at least 3 of the new faculty are included in this table.
[c]Reflects percentage of the 171 new faculty who indicated the institution from which they received the doctorate.

New faculty tended to spend: (a) more days a month attending professional meetings, (b) more time with graduate students, (c) more time on committee work, and (d) substantially more time on research and writing activities. In addition, new faculty were less satisfied with their present position, although the number reporting dissatisfaction was less than 10%. Also, they voiced less commitment to academic careers; over two thirds of the experienced faculty (68%) disagreed with the statement, "I am likely to leave academe for other employment," while 56% of the new faculty rejected this statement (not tabled).

Compared with their experienced colleagues, slightly more new faculty identified with K-12 administration than with higher education administration (Table 6-6). This tendency was more pronounced for women, as 80% of the new female faculty (compared with 58% of the experienced female faculty) reported K-12 administration as their primary level of emphasis. New faculty at UCEA-member institutions were more than twice as likely as their counterparts at non-UCEA institutions to designate higher education administration as their level of concentration (26% compared with 12%).

Table 6-5 Discriminant Analysis on Length of Time as a Professor

Discriminating variables	Faculty Member 5 or Fewer Years (N=97) *M*	SD	Faculty Member More Than 5 Years (N=544) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities							
Time spent supervising doctoral work	6.46	7.09	10.55	10.50	.92	E-02	.09
Days per month attending professional meetings	3.13	2.94	2.78	2.66	-.27	E-01	-.07
Time spent teaching graduate students	43.70	21.05	40.28	21.93	-.61	E-02	-.13
Time spent in committee work	8.26	7.82	6.53	7.51	-.23	E-01	-.18
Time spent on research and writing	18.24	15.38	11.56	11.73	-.20	E-01	-.25
Attitudes							
Satisfaction with research	2.81	0.98	2.87	1.10	.17		.18
Need higher standards for graduate student admissions	2.64	1.27	2.99	1.16	.13		.15
Best faculty are leaving academe	2.93	1.02	3.29	0.85	.15		.14
Former practitioners make the best professors	2.99	1.37	2.97	1.30	.87	E-01	.11
Field studies strengthen practice	2.32	1.00	2.34	0.89	-.93	E-01	-.08
Satisfaction with present position	2.06	1.10	1.87	1.03	-.82	E-01	-.09
Likely to leave academe for other employment	3.72	1.16	4.05	1.25	-.74	E-01	-.09
Other							
Present age	42.93	7.62	52.78	7.37	.15		1.12
External income	3.13	2.29	3.39	2.29	.33	E-01	.07
Age entered professorship	39.90	7.68	35.77	6.45	-.14		-.96
Group Centroids							
Professor 5 or fewer years							-2.09
Professor more than 5 years							.37
Classification Analysis	% of Cases Correctly Classified						
Professor 5 or fewer years	98.30	1.70					
Professor more than 5 years	11.90	88.10					
	89.48% Correctly Classified						
Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue		Correlation		Wilks lambda	x^2	D.F. Significance
	.77		.66		.56	362.85	17 .0001

There was surprising concordance between new and experienced faculty in their perceptions of what constituted problems in educational administration programs. Most faculty did not consider any of the following to be very serious problems: placing students in administrative positions or the professoriate, pressure to publish, number of able students, low salaries, amount of time spent by professors in private consulting, increase in off-campus teaching, or lack of appropriate competency standards for students. However, as discussed in Chapter 5, over one fifth of the experienced faculty felt that two aspects of their work were very serious problems: lack of university support for their department, and the heavy teaching and advising loads in their department. The only item considered by more than one fifth of the new faculty to be a very serious problem was the small proportion of

Table 6-6 Level of Administrative Concentration of New and Experienced Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate									
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total		Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Level																				
K-12 administration	91	72	41	80	34	68	98	77	132	75	734	73	49	58	191	62	615	75	806	72
Community college administration	3	2	—	—	1	2	2	2	3	2	16	2	1	1	8	3	9	1	17	2
Higher education administration	21	17	7	14	13	26	15	12	28	16	135	13	20	24	61	20	95	12	156	14
Other	4	3	1	2	1	2	5	4	5	3	44	4	9	11	17	6	39	5	56	5
No response	7	6	2	4	1	2	7	6	9	5	85	8	5	6	32	10	58	7	90	8
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,034	100	84	100	309	100	816	100	1,125*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes seven experienced respondents who did not indicate their gender.

women and minorities in the profession (Table 6-7). In general, the attitudes of new faculty were similar to those of experienced colleagues. This may be because candidates who already "fit the mold" are hired, or new faculty are rapidly socialized into the dominant value structure.

Table 6-7 Perceptions of Selected Problems among New and Experienced Faculty Members (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate					Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate				
Problem areas	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response	Very serious	Rather serious	Moderately serious	No problem	No response
Lack of university support for my department	14	22	34	28	3	20	22	32	24	3
Heavy teaching and advising load in my department	18	22	31	28	2	22	21	26	28	3
Low level of salaries in my department	19	25	35	19	3	15	21	40	21	4
Small proportion of women and minorities in our profession	26	19	31	20	5	17	20	32	27	4
Growing regulatory power of states in graduate educational administration programs	12	18	35	32	3	23	22	30	21	4
Quality faculty leaving academe	10	19	30	38	3	6	13	32	46	4

New and experienced faculty also reflected more similarities than differences in their level of agreement with selected statements about preparation programs and the field of educational administration. For example, the majority of both cohorts agreed that quality teaching and research are interdependent, that more contact with professors at other universities is desirable, and that faculty members should participate extensively in scholarly meetings. Neither group supported abolishing the tenure system (not tabled).

Although the differences between the two cohorts were insignificant on most items, a few discrepancies were noteworthy. New faculty were more likely than their experienced colleagues to agree that more of the educational administration literature should be theory based (58% compared with 39%), that their university's standards for promotion and tenure should be more explicit (48% compared with 39%), and that student admission standards should be higher (48% compared with 38%, not tabled).

Table 6-8 Ratings of Preparation Program Quality by New and Experienced Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate									
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total		Male		Female		UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Excellent	25	20	8	16	12	24	21	17	33	19	309	30	19	23	100	31	228	28	328	29
Good	72	57	18	35	22	44	68	54	90	51	531	51	51	61	141	46	445	55	586	52
Fair	20	16	21	41	11	22	30	24	41	23	151	15	11	13	47	15	116	14	163	15
Poor	5	4	2	4	3	6	4	3	7	4	18	2	2	2	9	3	11	1	20	2
No response	4	3	2	4	2	4	4	3	6	4	25	2	1	1	12	4	16	2	28	3
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,034	100	84	100	309	100	816	100	1,125*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes seven experienced respondents who did not indicate their gender.

A majority of new and experienced faculty rated their preparation programs as "good" or "excellent," but new faculty were not as satisfied with the quality of their preparation programs as were their senior colleagues. For example, 29% of the faculty with more than 5 years of experience rated their program as "excellent" compared with 19% of the new faculty (Table 6-8). As will be discussed in the next section, new women faculty were not as positive as men about the quality of their preparation programs.

While both new and experienced faculty indicated that "curriculum reform in preparation programs" was the most significant need facing the field, differences existed between the cohorts concerning the second most significant need (Table 6-9). The experienced faculty ranked "more able students" as the second most pressing need, whereas the new faculty rated "more attention to practical problems" as the second most pressing concern. "A more extensive knowledge base," which was the third-ranked need in the field among the experienced faculty, did not appear in the top five most pressing concerns of new faculty.

Within the new faculty cohort, significant differences existed between respondents at UCEA-member institutions and their non-UCEA counterparts regarding perceptions of the most critical needs facing the field. New faculty at UCEA-member programs ranked "external support for research and development activities" as by far the most pressing need, with "more emphasis on research" and "more able students" tied for second place. The top three needs according to their counterparts at non-UCEA institutions were the same as the rankings of the total new faculty cohort.

Like the experienced faculty, the new cohort did not commit a large portion of time to committee work (see Table 6-12 in the next section) and viewed such activities as the least enjoyable aspect of the professorial role. However, new faculty spent more time on university committees than did experienced faculty, the opposite of what might be expected, given the pressure on junior faculty to engage in research and scholarly publication. One possible explanation is that new faculty understand that they need their colleagues' support for promotion and tenure, and they view service on university committees as a way of becoming known in the university. In addition, many of the new faculty were women, and as discussed later, women tend to spend more time than men on faculty committees.

Comparison of Male and Female New Faculty Members' Activities and Attitudes

Since women comprised a disproportionate number of new faculty, we performed a discriminant analysis for the new faculty group with gender as the dependent variable. Thirteen variables differentiated new male from new female faculty (Table 6-10). Women (a) were less satisfied with their salary, (b) had more income from external sources (e.g., consulting) and summer teaching, (c) were less likely to agree that former practitioners make the best faculty, and (d) were less likely to believe that the best professors were leaving the academy. Men (a) received higher academic year salaries (the average salary for men was about $35,000 compared

Table 6-9 Most Significant Need Facing the Field Reported by New and Experienced Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate									
	Male N	%*	Female N	%	UCEA N	%	Non-UCEA N	%	Total N	%	Male N	%	Female N	%	UCEA N	%	Non-UCEA N	%	Total N	%
More able students	18	14	5	10	7	14	16	13	23	13	159	15	5	6	50	16	115	14	165	15
More extensive knowledge base	8	6	8	16	4	8	12	9	16	9	143	14	10	12	56	18	98	12	154	14
More attention to practical problems	22	18	3	6	5	10	20	16	25	14	121	12	5	6	23	7	103	13	126	11
More emphasis on research	8	6	6	12	7	14	7	6	14	8	45	4	4	5	21	7	29	4	50	4
Curriculum reform	20	16	9	18	4	8	25	20	29	16	162	16	18	21	47	15	133	16	180	16
More faculty with expertise in related disciplines	10	8	1	2	5	10	6	5	11	6	42	4	5	6	15	5	32	4	47	4
More external support for research	15	12	7	14	11	22	11	9	22	12	108	10	13	16	44	14	77	9	121	11
Closer ties with practitioners	15	12	5	10	5	10	15	12	20	11	121	12	9	11	16	5	114	14	130	12
Other	—	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	1	39	4	2	2	6	2	36	4	42	4
No response	10	8	6	12	2	4	14	11	16	9	94	9	13	16	31	10	79	10	110	10
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,034	100	84	100	309	100	816	100	1,125*	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" includes seven experienced respondents who did not indicate their gender.

with about $30,000 for women), (b) were less likely to perceive off-campus teaching as a problem, (c) were more likely to agree that field studies strengthen practice, and (d) were more satisfied with the caliber of their students.

Table 6-10 Discriminant Analysis on Male and Female New Faculty

Discriminating variables	Men (N=60) *M*	SD	Women (N=20) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities						
Time spent teaching undergraduate students	5.27	12.05	1.25	3.58	.32 E-01	.35
Attitudes						
Increase in off-campus teaching is a problem	3.37	.90	2.80	1.00	.94	.88
Satisfaction with current salary	2.92	1.29	3.55	1.19	-.38	-.48
Field studies strengthen practice	2.42	.93	2.15	.99	.85	.80
Best faculty are leaving academe	3.00	.99	3.05	.99	-.34	-.34
Faculty should participate in professional meetings	2.03	.82	1.80	.83	.41	.34
Satisfaction with students' caliber	2.63	.97	2.85	.67	.66	.60
Former practitioners make the best faculty	2.73	1.35	3.35	1.22	-.32	-.42
Higher standards needed for graduate admissions	2.70	1.31	2.35	1.14	.24	.30
Pressure for external funding is a problem	3.17	.90	2.95	1.05	.28	.27
Other						
External income	3.10	2.36	3.45	2.82	-.20	-.49
Current academic salary	4.42	1.79	3.70	1.72	.27	.48
Summer school income	3.53	1.95	4.05	2.30	-.13	-.26
Group Centroids						
Male					.44	
Female					-1.33	
Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership					
Male	69.0		31.0			
Female	37.3		62.7			
	67.21% of Cases Correctly Classified					
Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue		Correlation		Wilks lambda	x^2 D.F. Significance
	.606		.614		.623	33.85 13 .001

Given that a marked gender difference in compensation was noted for the entire 1986 cohort (see Chapter 3), we assumed that by controlling for length of time in the professoriate and rank, the influence of gender on salary might be eliminated. However, gender-related salary differences persisted (Table 6-11). Female assistant and associate professors in the new faculty cohort received several thousand dollars less in academic year salary than did their male counterparts, which is consistent with data released by the American Association of University Professors (1987) on

Table 6-11 Academic Year Salary of Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and Rank

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate														Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male Assist. Prof. N	%*	Female Assist. Prof. N	%	Male Assoc. Prof. N	%	Female Assoc. Prof. N	%	Male Prof. N	%	Female Prof. N	%	Total N	%	N	%
Less than $20,000	1	2	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	2	15	1
$20,000-$24,999	11	18	11	33	1	3	1	6	1	5	—	—	27	15	17	2
$25,000-$29,999	24	39	17	52	6	16	4	25	—	—	—	—	52	29	69	6
$30,000-$34,999	14	23	2	6	15	40	6	38	3	16	—	—	41	23	161	14
$35,000-$39,999	6	10	3	9	6	16	2	13	2	11	—	—	19	11	259	23
$40,000-$44,999	3	5	—	—	5	13	2	13	6	32	1	50	17	10	216	19
$45,000-$49,999	—	—	—	—	3	8	—	—	3	16	1	50	8	5	136	12
$50,000-$54,999	1	2	—	—	1	3	1	6	2	11	—	—	5	3	108	10
$55,000 or more	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	11	—	—	3	2	125	11
No response	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	19	2
Total	61	100	33	100	38	100	16	100	19	100	2	100	177*	100	1,125	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
*The "total" for new faculty includes eight male respondents who indicated that they held nonprofessorial ranks or did not indicate their rank.

faculty salaries across disciplines (see also McMillen, 1987). Of the new assistant professors in educational administration, only 15% of the females compared with 42% of the males made $30,000 or more for the academic year.

As noted previously, new faculty tended to devote more time to committee work than did their more experienced colleagues. Within the new faculty group, women spent more time in committee work than did their male counterparts (Table 6-12). This gender difference is not surprising, given the pressure to have female representation on most university committees and the underrepresentation of women in faculty ranks.

Within the new faculty group, there were also gender differences in perceptions of the most pressing needs in the field and of the quality of their own preparation programs. "Curriculum reform" was ranked first by new female faculty, followed by "a more extensive knowledge base" and "more external support for research and development activities." New male faculty ranked "more attention to practical problems" as the most pressing need, followed by "curriculum reform" and "more able students" (see Table 6-9). As noted in the prior section, new male faculty also tended to rate the quality of their preparation program higher than did their female colleagues; over three fourths of the men compared with about half of the women rated their programs as "good" or "excellent" (see Table 6-8).

Gender differences within the new faculty cohort are further highlighted in the following sections which address job satisfaction, research orientation, and preparation program preference. We also note differences between new faculty members at UCEA institutions and their non-UCEA counterparts.

Job Satisfaction

To determine whether length of service in the professoriate predicted job satisfaction, we performed multiple regressions for new and experienced faculty. Like their more experienced colleagues, new faculty members with lower salaries and those who perceived the intellectual climate of their department as poor were less satisfied with their roles. These two variables accounted for about 30% of the variance in job satisfaction for new faculty (Table 6-13) and about 24% of the variance for the experienced cohort (not tabled).

Three quarters of the new faculty indicated that, if they had to make the choice again, they would choose a professorial career. However, only 70% of the women in the new faculty group indicated that they would make this choice again compared with 81% of the men (not tabled). New faculty women also were the least satisfied with their current position; over one fifth (22%) reported dissatisfaction with their current role compared with 8% of new male faculty (Table 6-14). Given the gender differences in compensation, it was not surprising that new female faculty were less satisfied with their salaries than were their male counterparts (53% voiced dissatisfaction compared to 32% of the males).

Table 6-12 Portion of Time Devoted to Committee Work by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and Rank

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate														Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male Assist. Prof.		Female Assist. Prof.		Male Assoc. Prof.		Female Assoc. Prof.		Male Prof.		Female Prof.		Total			
Percentage of time	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	19	31	6	18	6	16	7	43	5	26	—	—	48	27	363	32
1-5	21	34	9	27	18	47	4	25	9	47	—	—	64	36	317	28
6-10	11	18	11	33	10	26	3	19	4	21	1	50	40	23	201	18
11-15	3	5	1	3	2	5	—	—	—	—	1	50	7	4	65	6
16-20	4	7	4	12	1	3	—	—	1	5	—	—	10	6	103	9
21-25	3	5	1	3	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	3	24	2
26 or more	—	—	1	3	—	—	2	13	—	—	—	—	3	3	52	5
Total	61	100	33	100	38	100	16	100	19	100	2	100	177[a]	100	1,125	100
Mean	6.6		9.5		7.0		7.5		5.2		12.5		7.0		6.8	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a]The "total" for new faculty includes eight male respondents who indicated that they held nonprofessorial ranks or did not indicate their rank.

Table 6-13 Multiple Regression on Job Satisfaction* for New Faculty

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Poor intellectual climate viewed as problem	-.259	-.357	.223	51.50**
Current academic salary	-.083	-.200	.301	20.57**
Low salary levels in department viewed as problem	-.188	-.262	.336	10.25**
Believe former practitioners make best faculty	.094	.167	.361	7.66**
External income	.049	.155	.376	5.27*
Lack of able students viewed as problem	-.110	-.141	.391	5.17*

*p. <.05
**p. <.01
*Job satisfaction is composed of six items related to satisfaction in the professorial role.

Over three fourths (78%) of the new faculty at non-UCEA institutions and two thirds (66%) of the UCEA cohort were satisfied or very satisfied with their current positions. New faculty at UCEA institutions were somewhat less satisfied with the caliber of their graduates than were their non-UCEA counterparts (Table 6-14).

Research Orientation

Using the research orientation scale described in Chapter 4, we conducted a regression analysis to examine the orientation of new faculty toward research. Five variables contributed to the research orientation equation (Table 6-15). As with their experienced colleagues, 27% of the variance in research orientation among new faculty was predicted by two variables: (a) whether the respondents disagreed with the statement that former practitioners make the best faculty (24%), and (b) whether they perceived "pressure to publish" to be a problem (3%).

New faculty were more interested in research than were their experienced colleagues; 24% of the new faculty declared research to be their greatest strength, compared with 13% of experienced faculty (Table 6-16). Over twice the percentage of new faculty indicated that research was the aspect of the professorship they most enjoyed (24% compared to 11% of the experienced cohort, Table 6-17). New faculty also spent considerably more time in research and scholarly activities (18% of the work week) than did their more experienced counterparts (12% of the work week, Table 6-18).

Among the new faculty cohort, women were more likely to designate research as their primary strength than were their male peers (28% compared with 23%) and to devote more time to research (22% compared with 16%, not tabled). New female assistant professors devoted almost a quarter of their time (23%) to research compared with 19% for their male counterparts at this rank.

Table 6-14 Satisfaction of Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation (Reported in Percentages)

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate																								Respondents with more than 5 years experience in the professoriate (N=1,125)					
	Male (N=50)						Female (N=127)						UCEA (N=126)						Non-UCEA (N=51)						Total (N=177)											
	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	No response
Present position	41	37	12	6	2	2	31	33	12	22	—	2	34	32	14	14	4	2	40	38	11	9	1	2	38	36	12	10	2	2	52	38	9	6	3	2
Current salary	12	29	25	20	12	2	4	24	18	33	20	2	12	26	30	18	12	2	9	28	21	26	15	2	10	28	23	24	14	2	16	34	21	20	7	2
Caliber of colleagues	14	34	29	19	3	1	12	26	31	26	6	—	16	24	28	24	8	—	13	35	30	20	2	1	14	32	29	21	4	1	17	36	27	15	4	2
Caliber of students	7	52	22	15	3	1	2	39	33	24	2	—	4	42	28	22	4	—	6	50	24	16	2	1	6	48	25	18	3	1	2	46	27	12	2	2

Table 6-15 Multiple Regression on Research Orientation[a] for New Faculty

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Believe former practitioners make the best faculty	1.000	.469	.244	57.73**
Pressure to publish viewed as problem	.521	.196	.275	8.47**
Percentage of time spent with doctoral students	.062	.192	.306	8.88**
Number of master's committees chaired	-.026	-.144	.325	5.78*
Believe faculty should be more involved in university decisions	.372	.137	.340	4.92*

*p. <.05
**p. <.01
[a]Research orientation is composed of six items related to inquiry activities.

Table 6-16 Area of Primary Strength Reported by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non UCEA		Total			
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching	78	62	29	57	21	42	86	68	107	61	774	69
Research	29	23	14	28	21	42	22	17	43	24	141	13
Service	17	14	6	12	7	14	16	13	23	13	160	14
No response	2	2	2	4	1	2	3	2	4	2	50	4
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,125	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 6-17 Aspect of the Professorial Role Most Enjoyed by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male		Female		UCEA		Non UCEA		Total			
	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching undergraduate students	4	3	1	2	1	2	4	3	5	3	52	5
Teaching graduate students	61	48	19	37	17	34	63	50	80	45	571	51
Supervising doctoral work	7	6	1	2	2	4	6	5	8	5	75	7
Research and writing	25	20	17	33	22	44	20	16	42	24	122	11
Consulting	15	12	7	14	3	6	19	15	22	12	96	9
Committee work	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	1
Directing program/projects	2	2	3	6	1	2	4	3	5	3	74	7
Other	2	2	—	—	2	4	—	—	2	1	7	1
No response	10	8	3	6	2	4	11	9	13	7	118	11
Total	126	100	51	100	50	100	127	100	177	100	1,125	100

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 6-18 Portion of Time Devoted to Research by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and Rank

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate														Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male Assist. Prof.		Female Assist. Prof.		Male Assoc. Prof.		Female Assoc. Prof.		Male Prof.		Female Prof.		Total			
Percentage of time	N	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None or no response	7	11	3	9	7	19	4	25	6	32	—	—	30	17	290	26
1- 9	10	16	5	15	6	16	2	13	5	26	—	—	28	16	258	23
10-19	14	23	8	24	9	24	2	13	7	38	—	—	44	25	306	27
20-29	15	25	7	21	12	32	5	31	—	—	1	50	41	23	180	16
30-39	5	8	3	9	1	3	1	6	1	5	1	50	12	7	48	4
40-49	6	10	5	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	6	18	2
50 or more	4	7	2	6	3	8	2	13	—	—	—	—	11	6	25	2
Total	61	100	33	100	38	100	16	100	19	100	2	100	177•	100	1,125	100
Mean	19.3		23.1		16.7		17.4		6.4		29.0		17.5		11.5	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
•The "total" for new faculty includes eight male respondents who indicated that they held nonprofessorial ranks or did not indicate their rank.

Differences between the UCEA and non-UCEA cohorts within the new faculty group were even more pronounced than were gender distinctions. Over two fifths (42%) of the UCEA new faculty members, but only 17% of their non-UCEA counterparts, indicated that research was their primary strength (see Table 6-16). In fact, the UCEA new faculty cohort was the only subgroup that did not place teaching above research as the area of primary strength. Also, a much higher proportion of the UCEA new faculty members indicated that research was the most enjoyable aspect of the professorship (44% compared with 16% of the non-UCEA group). The UCEA respondents devoted an average of 26% of their time to research activities, whereas their non-UCEA colleagues devoted 14% of their time to research (Table 6-19). Without question, the recently hired faculty members at UCEA-member institutions have a commitment to research and enjoy engaging in such scholarly pursuits. Consistent with this pattern, 44% of the UCEA new faculty cohort indicated that the American Educational Research Association was their most important professional association, while only 14% of the non-UCEA group made this choice (not tabled).

Table 6-19 Portion of Time Devoted to Research by New Faculty at UCEA and Non-UCEA Institutions

	UCEA		Non-UCEA		Total	
Percentage of time	N	%*	N	%	N	%
None or no response	4	8	26	20	30	17
1-9	2	4	26	20	28	16
10-19	8	16	36	28	44	25
20-29	17	34	24	19	41	23
30-39	5	10	7	6	12	7
40-49	8	16	3	2	11	6
50 or more	6	12	5	4	11	6
Total	50	100	127	100	177	100
Mean	26.2		14.0		17.5	

*Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Perceptions Regarding Program Orientation and Research Emphasis

In general, perceptions of current and preferred program orientation and research emphasis were comparable for the new and experienced faculty cohorts; however, some differences were apparent. New faculty were more likely to view their own programs as oriented towards preparing practitioners (85% compared

with 77% of the experienced cohort). A higher percentage of new faculty *preferred* a program that is equally balanced between preparing practitioners and professors/researchers (38% compared with 32% for the experienced group, Table 6-20).

Table 6-20 Current and Preferred Orientation of Graduate Program Reported by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male (N=126)		Female (N=51)		UCEA (N=50)		Non UCEA (N=127)		Total (N=177)		Total (N=1,125)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Current orientation of graduate program												
More towards preparing practitioners	105	83	45	88	36	72	114	90	150	85	869	77
More towards preparing professors/researchers	5	4	1	2	3	6	3	2	6	3	66	6
Equally balanced between the two	11	9	5	10	10	20	6	5	16	9	129	12
No response	5	4	—	—	1	2	4	3	5	3	61	5
Preferred orientation of graduate program												
More towards preparing practitioners	66	52	14	28	11	22	69	54	80	45	567	50
More towards preparing professors/researchers	10	8	4	8	9	18	5	4	14	8	68	6
Equally balanced between the two	37	29	30	59	26	52	41	32	67	38	350	32
No response	13	10	3	6	4	8	12	9	16	9	131	12

Within the new faculty group, there were significant differences concerning preferred program emphasis when respondents were grouped by gender and UCEA affiliation. Men were almost twice as likely to prefer a practitioner emphasis (52% compared to 28%), and women were almost twice as likely to advocate a balance between preparing practitioners and researchers/professors (59% compared to 29%). Less than one third of the non-UCEA cohort (32%) compared with over half of the UCEA group (52%) preferred such a balance in program orientation. Consistent with their practitioner orientation, non-UCEA new faculty members were more than twice as likely to designate consulting activities as the most enjoyable aspect of the professorship (15% compared to 6%, see Table 6-17).

We also found differences among the subgroups within the new faculty cohort regarding perceived departmental emphasis in research. The UCEA new faculty members were almost twice as likely as their non-UCEA peers to indicate that their programs placed equal emphasis on quantitative and qualitative research approaches (40% compared to 21%, Table 6-21). Women were more likely than men to believe that research was not emphasized enough in their own programs (29% compared to 20%).

Table 6-21 Current and Preferred Departmental Emphasis on Research Reported by Experienced Faculty and New Faculty Grouped by Gender and UCEA Affiliation

	Respondents with 5 or fewer years of experience in the professoriate										Respondents with more than 5 years of experience in the professoriate	
	Male (N=126)		Female (N=51)		UCEA (N=50)		Non-UCEA (N=127)		Total (N=177)		Total (N=1,125)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Current departmental emphasis on research												
Qualitative approaches	23	18	9	18	6	12	26	21	32	18	174	16
Quantitative approaches	27	21	15	29	13	26	29	23	42	24	314	28
Balance between qualitative and quantitative approaches	36	29	10	20	20	40	26	21	46	26	319	28
Research not emphasized	25	20	15	29	8	16	32	25	40	23	230	20
No response	15	12	2	4	3	6	14	11	17	10	88	8
Preferred departmental emphasis on research												
Qualitative approaches	25	20	7	14	4	8	28	22	32	18	245	22
Quantitative approaches	7	6	2	4	2	4	7	6	9	5	76	7
Balance between qualitative and quantitative approaches	65	52	39	77	40	80	64	50	104	59	569	51
Research not emphasized	8	6	2	4	—	—	10	8	10	6	83	7
No response	21	17	1	2	4	8	18	14	22	12	152	14

While more new faculty felt that quantitative (24%) rather than qualitative (18%) approaches were currently emphasized in their departments, only 5% *preferred* an emphasis on quantitative approaches while 18% voiced a preference for qualitative approaches to be emphasized. Eighty percent of the UCEA cohort compared with half of the non-UCEA group preferred a balance between quantitative and qualitative approaches (Table 6-21). Over three fourths of the new female faculty (77%) compared with 52% of the males preferred such a balance in research approaches.

Summary

New educational administration faculty differed in some important ways from their more experienced counterparts. More were women, and of course, they were younger as a group. Because they had not been faculty members very long, only a small fraction of the new cohort was tenured or held the rank of professor. New faculty were more interested in and spent more time in inquiry-related activities. Also, new faculty were less satisfied with the quality of their preparation programs.

However, many attitudes were quite similar across the new and experienced cohorts. Both groups cited curriculum reform as the most important issue facing the field. Both viewed committee work as the least satisfying aspect of the professorial role. Both groups were generally complacent about problems confronting preparation programs.

Some interesting differences were apparent *within* the new faculty cohort. Salary policies which favor men operated at all ranks, even assistant professor. Women were less satisfied with their role, particularly with salary. They were more interested in research and favored preparation programs equally balanced between preparing researchers/professors and practitioners. Women also spent more time in committee work. Although junior faculty are generally expected to devote their energies to research to earn tenure, new women faculty probably receive considerable pressure to serve on committees. Some of this committee activity may also reflect women's interest in encouraging change through collaboration (Shakeshaft, 1987). However, such involvement in committee work might also contribute to the higher level of dissatisfaction among women faculty, given that committee work was considered the least enjoyable aspect of the professorial role.

New faculty at UCEA-member institutions were quite different from their non-UCEA counterparts. The new faculty in UCEA programs were younger, were concentrated in lower ranks, and were considerably more interested and involved in research activities. They were more likely to prefer a program balanced between preparing practitioners and researchers/professors and a departmental research emphasis that includes both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Although new faculty were satisfied with their present position, they were less committed to the professoriate as evidenced by their interest in seeking positions outside the academy. Whether these data are cause for alarm is not clear without further information. For example, new faculty may be hesitant to declare a career commitment to the professoriate because a nontenured appointment is somewhat tenuous. Before new faculty members can make commitments to their institutions and the professoriate, they must feel comfortable in the role and secure in the institutional environment.

Note

1. Given the similarities between new faculty at research and UCEA-member institutions and between new faculty at comprehensive and non-UCEA institutions coupled with the small number of new faculty from doctorate-granting institutions (n=18), data in this chapter are not reported with respondents grouped by the Carnegie (1987) classification of institutions of higher education.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 7 ❖❖❖

INDICES OF QUALITY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Estimates of educational quality have recently captured the interest of state and federal policy makers and have long been of curiosity and concern to university administrators and faculty. Because quality is a multidimensional construct (Kuh, 1981), it is not surprising that the quality of academic programs has been estimated using different approaches. Most quality assessments rely on information from one or more of four categories: resources, reputation, outcomes, and the "value-addedness" of a program (i.e., benefits realized through participation) (Conrad & Wilson, 1985).

The resource view includes variables such as number of faculty, faculty compensation, funds for travel, and library holdings. The reputational view relies on judgments of persons, such as faculty members, considered knowledgeable about what is to be evaluated (i.e., program quality and faculty credentials). The outcome view emphasizes measurable products such as number and "quality" of scholarly publications (i.e., status of journal or press) or number of graduates obtaining faculty appointments at prestigious institutions. As far as we know, a

value-added approach has not been used to estimate the quality of preparation programs in educational administration, nor do we have any indicators from this study that will allow us to infer "value-addedness."

Estimates of Quality in Educational Administration Programs

Students, preparation program faculty, chief state school officers, school superintendents, and others make judgments every day about the quality of educational administration programs. However, few attempts have been made in the last 3 decades to empirically assess the quality of preparation programs. Only two studies have been published which attempted to assess the quality of preparation programs using reputational rankings (Lutz & Dow, 1981; Shaplin, 1964). In addition, a doctoral dissertation (Sims, 1970) also used informed opinion in an effort to identify prestigious educational administration programs.[1] All three studies relied primarily on faculty at UCEA-member institutions to identify high-quality programs.

In Shaplin's (1964) study, faculty at UCEA institutions nominated programs from which they would prefer to select future colleagues. Because many respondents indicated that their nominations were not prioritized, Shaplin was careful to point out that the resulting list of institutions did not constitute a rank order, but only programs with strong reputations. Eleven institutions were listed more than five times: University of Chicago, The Ohio State University, Stanford University, University of Illinois, University of California-Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Teachers College-Columbia, Harvard University, Michigan State University, and University of Oregon. Together these institutions produced 57% of the faculty appointed at UCEA-member institutions between 1958 and 1963.

Shaplin also found considerable overlap when comparing the list of preferred programs with the institutions from which faculty at UCEA-member institutions had received their degrees. While recently appointed faculty had degrees from 45 different institutions, only 13 programs produced three or more faculty each, a total of 68% of professors appointed from 1958 through 1963. The University of Chicago and Teachers College-Columbia produced 40% of the faculty hired during this period at UCEA institutions. Seventeen of the 37 institutions responding employed one or more of their own graduates; 22% of the total faculty were employed at the institution from which they received their doctorate. Twelve of the 13 programs producing the most faculty (9 of which were also the programs most often mentioned as "preferred") hired 17 of their own graduates, or 38% of the positions filled at UCEA-member institutions during this period. Apparently, academic inbreeding was an acceptable practice in educational administration programs in the early 1960s.

Sims (1970) attempted to identify the quality of the major educational administration departments by asking faculty at 80 institutions (all UCEA-member programs and other institutions which conferred a high number of doctorates in educational administration) to rate doctoral programs by the quality of faculty,

program quality, and a global rating of relative quality. There was general agreement on the relative standing of the departments as to quality of faculty and program. The 20 programs highest in prestige were, in alphabetical order: University of California-Berkeley, University of California-Los Angeles, University of Chicago, Claremont Graduate School, University of Florida, Harvard University, University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, New York University, The Ohio State University, University of Oregon, Stanford University, Syracuse University, Teachers College-Columbia, University of Texas, and University of Wisconsin-Madison.

In the other published study using reputational rankings, Lutz and Dow (1981) attempted to estimate the quality of educational administration programs by asking UCEA-program representatives from each of the 47 member institutions to rank-order the UCEA programs. Professors of educational administration with national reputations were identified using a similar nomination process. The variables positively related to national status of departments were: (a) total publications of all faculty, (b) number of "great persons" (i.e., nationally recognized professors) on the faculty, (c) number of doctoral candidates in residence, (d) number of full-time faculty, (e) amount of faculty salaries, (f) range of faculty salaries, and (g) number of different courses offered. A rank-ordered list of UCEA programs was not provided.

The final report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) and other reports have underscored the need to improve the quality of administrator preparation. Because relatively little attention has been given to quality indices in preparation programs, exhortations about what constitutes quality have lacked empirical substantiation. The remainder of this chapter highlights data from the 1986 study that provide some insights into the relative quality of faculty and programs.

Resources

The data presented in Chapters 2 and 3 indicated that, compared with other institutions, UCEA-member and research universities have more resources invested in educational administration preparation programs. On the average, these programs have more full-time faculty (see Table 2-3), pay faculty more, provide more funds for professional development purposes, and offer more clerical support (see Tables 2-5, 2-6). The amount of support provided by UCEA-member and research institutions does not necessarily represent an optimum level, however.

Reputation

Some scholars consider reputational rankings to be specious. For instance, Webster (1985) observed:

> They [reputational rankings] have been called mere compendia of gossip, having little or no

basis in objective reality. It has been claimed that they correlate so highly with departments' faculty size or publication productivity that they are unnecessary; that they are subject to "halo effects," whereby the rater assessing a single department is influenced by the prestige of the whole institution; and that they are out of date as soon as they are published. They have been called invalid because of the "alumni effect," in which raters who have taught or studied in a department rate it higher than it should be. (p. 69)

It is true that reputational rankings are usually positively related to the number of full-time faculty, empirical measures of faculty productivity (Lawrence & Green, 1980), and support for faculty development (Conrad & Blackburn, 1986). Also, top-ranked institutions are often those which have produced a large proportion of faculty (Conrad & Blackburn, 1986).

The most pervasive criticism of reputational rankings is that they are inherently subjective. Some researchers, however, have argued that this criticism is unfair:

It ignores the fact that reputational studies are purposively based on "subjective" peer evaluations. Moreover, subjectivity cannot be completely avoided in evaluation studies, regardless of the evaluation technique used. As Cartter noted, even so-called objective measures (such as the number of Nobel laureates on the faculty) are, for the most part, "'subjective' measures once removed" (1966, p. 4). (Conrad & Blackburn, 1985, p. 305)

In spite of these and other caveats (Webster, 1981), reputational rankings are often used as surrogates to estimate quality, particularly when competition for resources is keen (Clark, 1976).

Top-Ranked Educational Administration Programs

In the absence of alternative quality measures, the 1986 respondents were asked to rank-order the top five educational administration preparation programs. We assumed that faculty members were sufficiently knowledgeable about colleagues, students, and program quality at other institutions to provide discriminating judgments.[2] The top programs were identified by computing rankings provided by those faculty respondents (51%) who completed this item on the individual faculty questionnaire. Composite institutional scores were computed by assigning 5 points for each first-place vote, 4 points for each second-place vote, and so on. Ninety-five different institutions were mentioned at least once, and 70 institutions received at least one first-place vote.

The 10 institutions with the highest ranked educational administration programs were Stanford University, The Ohio State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Texas-Austin, Harvard University, Indiana University, University of Chicago, University of Oregon, Teachers College-Columbia, and Michigan State University (Table 7-1). All were research universities; half were members of UCEA.

Relative positions among the programs ranked highest by all respondents in 1986 shifted when rankings by certain subgroups of nominators were considered (Table 7-1). For example, the University of Wisconsin-Madison replaced Stanford as the top-rated program by respondents from UCEA-member institutions. Also,

the University of Utah was ranked ninth by UCEA respondents, but it did not appear among the top 10 ranked by the total group. The Pennsylvania State University was ranked sixth by respondents from research universities, while The Ohio State University received enough support from respondents at doctorate-granting institutions to replace Stanford as the highest ranked program. Penn State and the University of Michigan were ranked relatively high by female respondents, but they did not appear in the top 10 for male respondents.

Table 7-1 Top-Ranked Educational Administration Programs by Subgroups

Rank	All Respondents	K-12[a]	Higher Education[b]	UCEA[c]	Research[d]	Doctorate[e]	Comprehensive[f]	Men	Women
1	Stanford (996)[g]	Stanford (759)[g]	Stanford (142)[g]	Wisconsin (218)[g]	Stanford (371)[g]	Ohio St (234)[g]	Stanford (402)[g]	Stanford (920)[g]	Ohio St (96)[g]
2	Ohio St (900)	Ohio St (701)	Michigan (123)	Stanford (203)	Wisconsin (288)	Stanford (231)	Ohio St (398)	Ohio St (804)	Stanford (70)
3	Wisconsin (655)	Wisconsin (503)	UCLA (118)	Ohio St (177)	Ohio St (257)	Texas (161)	Harvard (254)	Wisconsin (591)	Wisconsin (64)
4	Texas (559)	Texas (418)	Penn St (113)	Texas (116)	Harvard (178)	Wisconsin (159)	Texas (251)	Texas (528)	Indiana (48)
5	Harvard (542)	Harvard (414)	Ohio St (101)	Indiana (113)	Indiana (173)	Harvard (111)	Wisconsin (208)	Harvard (510)	Penn St (37)
6	Indiana (427)	Indiana (322)	Michigan St (94)	Penn St (87)	Penn St (166)	Michigan St (110)	Columbia (171)	Indiana (379)	Michigan (35)
7	Chicago (369)	Oregon (301)	Indiana (75)	Oregon (81)	Texas (151)	Indiana (98)	Chicago (163)	Chicago (334)	Chicago (35)
8	Oregon (348)	Chicago (286)	Harvard (70)	Chicago (80)	Michigan St (119)	Chicago (89)	Indiana (159)	Oregon (315)	UCLA (33)
9	Columbia (338)	Columbia (238)	Columbia (67)	Utah (79)	Chicago (117)	Oregon (80)	UCLA (117)	Columbia (306)	Oregon (32)
10	Michigan St (312)	Michigan St (195)	Chicago (52)	Harvard (66)	Columbia (104)	Columbia (61)	Michigan (90)	Michigan St (290)	Harvard (30)

[a]Respondents whose primary assignment is preparation of K-12 administrators
[b]Respondents whose primary assignment is preparation of higher education administrators
[c]Respondents at UCEA-affiliated institutions
[d]Respondents at research institutions
[e]Respondents at doctorate-granting institutions
[f]Respondents at comprehensive institutions
[g]Numbers in parenthesis reflect total score based on 5 points for first place votes, 4 points for second place votes, etc.

Considerable shifting within the rank-ordered list occurred when we compared the nominations of respondents whose focus was the preparation of higher education administrators with the list generated by faculty whose focus was K-12 administration. Higher education faculty ranked Michigan (2), UCLA (3), and Penn State (4) high, but these institutions did not appear among the top 10 nominations of K-12 respondents. Apparently, whatever connotes quality to educational administration faculty members can be differentiated by their level of concentration.

All of the top-ranked programs in 1986 appeared in the list compiled by Sims (1970). Eight of the institutions ranked among the top 10 in 1986 also appeared on Shaplin's (1964) list of "preferred educational administration programs": Stanford, Ohio State, Wisconsin, Harvard, Chicago, Oregon, Columbia, and Michigan State. Two programs ranked high by respondents in 1986 were not on Shaplin's list: Indiana and Texas. Illinois and California-Berkeley were in Shaplin's group but did

not appear among the top-ranked programs in 1986. Michigan was on Shaplin's list and was rated high in 1986 by women, higher education faculty, and faculty at comprehensive institutions.

To determine if top-ranked educational administration programs could be differentiated empirically from other programs, we conducted discriminant analyses to compare data from the questionnaires completed by faculty at top-ranked programs and data from the departmental questionnaire provided by chairpersons.

Program Characteristics. Table 7-2 presents the results of the discriminant analysis of program characteristics of the top institutions nominated by all faculty responding to this item. Only eight programs are included because usable departmental forms were not returned by chairpersons at two of the ten highest ranked institutions. Positive coefficients reflect variables common to top-ranked programs while negative coefficients are associated with characteristics typical of all remaining programs.

Top-ranked programs (a) had more faculty (9.4 compared with 5), (b) were more likely to offer PhD programs in higher education and special education, (c) denied tenure to one or more faculty during the past 10 years, and (d) had been reorganized between 1976 and 1986. Unranked programs were more likely to (a) offer an EdS degree in higher education, (b) have more tenured white male associate professors, (c) have hired more minority males during the past 10 years, and (d) have more tenured minority males at the rank of professor. No differences were noted in the amount of funds for professional development or clerical support.

Faculty Characteristics. Table 7-3 presents the results of the discriminant analysis of characteristics and activities of faculty at the highest ranked programs and other programs. Once again, only 8 of the 10 highest ranked institutions are represented, as faculty questionnaires from two institutions arrived too late to be included in the data analysis. Because questionnaires with missing data had to be excluded from the analysis, only 653 cases were used to produce the model. Positive coefficients are more typical of faculty in top-ranked programs while negative coefficients are more common to faculty in other programs. Although 80% of the programs were correctly classified or "grouped," the Wilks lambda was quite high (.898) and the eigenvalue was low (.113), suggesting that only an average classification model was derived.

The best predictor of faculty in top-ranked programs was income. Faculty at top-ranked programs averaged $45,000-$49,999 in academic year salary while faculty at the remaining programs made about $10,000 less. Also, the income generated from external sources averaged $6,000-$8,000 for faculty at top-ranked programs and averaged only $2,000-$4,000 for respondents from other programs. In addition, faculty at top-ranked programs were less likely to be thinking about leaving the professoriate for other employment and also devoted more time to research and writing (Table 7-3). Thirty-eight percent of the faculty at top-ranked programs were receiving external funds to support research and development projects, compared with only 18% of faculty at unranked institutions (not tabled). Only five women (7%) and one minority faculty member (1.5%) were among the 64 faculty at top-ranked programs (not tabled).

Table 7-2 Discriminant Analysis on Departmental Characteristics of Highest Ranked Programs

Discriminating Variables	Top 8 Programs (N=8) *M*	SD	Other Programs (N=259) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Faculty Characteristics						
Minority male tenured associate professor	.38	1.06	.09	.35	.89	.34
Minority female tenured associate professor	.25	.46	.02	.15	1.92	.32
White male nontenured associate professor	.63	.74	.27	.54	.31	.17
White female tenured assistant professor	.13	.35	.03	.19	.67	.14
White male nontenured professor	.13	.35	.12	.42	-.32	-.13
Minority female tenured professor	0	0	.01	.09	-1.66	-.14
White female tenured associate professor	0	0	.15	.41	-.45	-.18
Minority male tenured professor	.25	.46	.17	.61	-.33	-.20
White male tenured associate professor	.50	.76	.85	1.32	-.38	-.49
Minority males hired during last 10 years	.38	.74	.28	.65	-.35	-.23
Degree Options						
PhD in higher education	.88	.35	.17	.38	1.10	.42
PhD in special education	.38	.52	.08	.27	.83	.23
Master's in "other" area	.38	.52	.14	.35	.47	.17
Master's in special education	.13	.35	.21	.41	-.36	-.15
EdS in higher education	0	0	.11	.32	-1.23	-.38
Size and Support						
Number of faculty	9.38	2.50	5.01	3.27	.41	.45
Increase in number of faculty over last 10 years	.88	1.64	.41	.97	.36	.36
Number of faculty denied tenure during last 10 years	1.50	1.77	.44	.85	.37	.33
Decrease in number of faculty over last 10 years	2.00	2.00	.90	1.44	.22	.32
Department restructured in last 10 years	1.63	.52	1.50	.50	.45	.22
Number of faculty remained stable over last 10 years	.13	.35	.38	.49	.37	.18

Group Centroids		
Top 8 Programs		3.57
Other Programs		-.11

Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership	
Top 8 Programs	100.00	0
Other Programs	4.00	96.00

96.07% of Cases Correctly Classified

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	x^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.396	.533	.716	84.87	21	.001

Faculty in unranked programs taught more hours per term, were less concerned about the quality of discourse at professional meetings, and were less satisfied with the caliber of their colleagues. Also, they were more likely than faculty at top-ranked programs to perceive the salary levels in their department as low and, therefore, a problem.

Table 7-3 Discriminant Analysis on Characteristics of Faculty at Highest Ranked Programs

Discriminating Variables	Faculty in Top 8 Programs (N=36) *M*	SD	Faculty in Other Programs (N=617) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities						
Time spent on research and writing	16.94	13.38	12.30	12.84	.02	.20
Time spent on "other" activities	3.19	10.77	1.78	7.37	.03	.15
Teaching hours in a semester	5.33	1.88	7.53	5.44	-.04	-.20
Attitudes						
Satisfied with current salary	2.56	1.00	2.76	1.21	.28	.34
Likely to leave academe	4.53	.91	3.96	1.25	.23	.29
Increase in off-campus teaching is a problem	3.56	.61	3.24	.91	.19	.17
Former practitioners make the best professors	3.47	1.13	2.93	1.32	.11	.14
Best faculty are leaving academe	3.44	.73	3.19	.90	.15	.13
Faculty should participate in professional meetings	2.17	1.00	1.98	.82	.16	.13
Satisfied with colleagues' caliber	2.33	1.31	2.54	1.05	-.26	-.28
Low quality of discourse at professional meetings is a problem	2.58	.97	3.03	.91	-.39	-.34
Other						
Current academic salary	7.11	1.63	5.58	1.85	.29	.54
External income	5.06	2.79	3.29	2.29	.20	.47

Group Centroids		
Top 8 Programs		1.40
Other Programs		-.08
Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership	
Top 8 Programs	61.80	38.20
Other Programs	18.40	81.60
	80.57% of Cases Correctly Classified	

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	χ^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.113	.320	.898	69.51	13	.001

Four fifths of the faculty at top-ranked programs, but only half of their counterparts at the remaining institutions, made nominations for the best educational administration doctoral programs. Of course, faculty at top-ranked programs may have perceived a proprietary interest in participating (e.g., the status of being associated with a top-ranked program). In any event, faculty at such institutions were probably more knowledgeable about other programs because of their experience as accreditation team members, external reviewers for promotion and tenure decisions, and curriculum consultants at other institutions.

When only the nominations from faculty at the 10 highest ranked programs were considered, the group of highest ranked institutions changed slightly from the list generated by all faculty making nominations. The institutions receiving the most first-place votes from faculty at top-ranked programs were Wisconsin, Stanford, Indiana, Michigan State, and Ohio State (not tabled). Three of these programs, Wisconsin, Ohio State, and Stanford, were rated in the Sims study as "distinguished" in terms of both faculty and program quality.

Job Satisfaction and Research Orientation of Faculty at Top-Ranked Institutions. In terms of job satisfaction, faculty at top-ranked programs were no more satisfied than were their colleagues elsewhere. For example, even though they made substantially more money, only 52% were satisfied or very satisfied with their salary, while 49% of their counterparts in unranked programs were satisfied or very satisfied.

To determine aspects of the work environment and the professorial role related to faculty satisfaction at top-ranked programs, we performed a step-wise multiple regression using the responses to the faculty questionnaires. Two variables accounted for about 56% of the variance in the job satisfaction equation (Table 7-4). As with their counterparts elsewhere, satisfaction of faculty at top-ranked institutions was positively related (32% of the variance) to academic year salary and concern about the poor intellectual climate of the department (24% of the variance).

Table 7-4 Multiple Regression Analysis on Job Satisfaction[a] Among Faculty at Eight Top-Rated Programs (N=68)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Current academic salary	-.224	-.538	.320	32.50**
Poor intellectual climate in department viewed as problem	-.405	-.478	.562	37.59**
Increase in off-campus teaching viewed as problem	-.233	-.185	.589	5.23*

*p <.05
**p <.005
[a]Job satisfaction is composed of six items related to satisfaction in the professorial role.

Five variables accounted for about 33% of the variance in faculty research orientation at top-ranked programs (Table 7-5). The best predictor (12% of the variance) was concern with the quality of discourse at professional meetings. Faculty with a strong research orientation were less likely to be concerned with the politics of academic life (6% of the variance) and more likely to cite the lack of able students as a serious problem (4% of the variance). Both salary (5% of the variance) and the number of meetings at which the respondent was a speaker (5% of the variance) were also positively related to research orientation (i.e., the higher the salary and number of presentations, the stronger the orientation to research).

Table 7-5 Multiple Regression Analysis on Research Orientation* Among Faculty at Eight Top-Rated Programs (N=68)

Variable	B	Beta	Adjusted R^2	F Change
Low quality of discourse at professional meetings viewed as problem	-1.238	-.433	.124	10.44**
Politics of academic life viewed as problem	.899	.319	.186	6.11*
Lack of able students viewed as problem	-.696	-.258	.228	4.50*
Current academic salary	-.391	-.284	.276	5.21*
Meetings attended as a speaker in past year	.274	.243	.326	5.72*

*p <.05
**p <.005
*Research orientation is composed of four items related to research activity.

Outcomes

One outcome measure of quality is productivity. We used selected information from the faculty questionnaire (e.g., number of articles and books published) to estimate scholarly productivity. Faculty at research institutions and UCEA-affiliated programs published more than their counterparts at other types of institutions. For example, as discussed in Chapter 4 (see Table 4-8), faculty at research universities produced more articles (M=11.4) during the previous 5-year period than colleagues at doctorate-granting (M=9.6) or comprehensive institutions (M=7.5). Similarly, faculty at UCEA-member institutions outproduced non-UCEA faculty—an average of 11.6 articles compared with 8.6. Also, the same relationships held for the number of books published (see Table 4-6) and the number of times respondents appeared as invited speakers (see Table 4-21). As might be expected, faculty at the top-rated institutions were the single most productive group, producing an average of 12.6 articles (mode=10) in the preceding 5-year period and 7.7 books (mode=3) in their careers (not tabled).

Information about the relative "quality" of scholarly contributions was not available. That is, we could not determine from these data to what degree the publications of faculty from top-rated or UCEA-member institutions influenced the direction of knowledge production by other researchers, as might be indicated by an analysis of citations (Smith & Fiedler, 1971), such as that provided by the Social Science Citation Index. Nor do we know if their publications were used to address problems in the field. Similarly, invited speeches could be major addresses at national meetings, informal colloquia at nearby institutions, or a guest lecture in a colleague's class. The relative "quality" or importance of the presentation may not be apparent from the type of audience; a major address may have been viewed as redundant material, while a colloquium for students may have been provocative and inspiring.

Another index of a preparation program's quality is the number of its graduates who become faculty members at other institutions (Conrad & Blackburn, 1986). Shaplin (1964) reported that UCEA faculty in 1964 received their doctorates from 45 different institutions, although 13 institutions produced 68% of the faculty. Campbell and Newell (1973) reported that half of the 1972 educational administration faculty cohort received their degrees from about 20 prestigious institutions. The 1986 data presented in Chapter 3 indicated that the number of institutions from which the majority of educational administration faculty received their doctorates has increased. The top 34 producers of all educational administration faculty accounted for 722 (59%) of the 1,214 respondents in 1986 who indicated the institution from which they received the doctorate; 29% received degrees from the 10 highest-producing institutions and 44% from 20 institutions (see Chapter 3, Table 3-23). Of the 34 institutions listed among the top producers, only Alabama, East Texas State, and Northern Colorado were not research universities.[3] Half (n=17) of the top producers were members of UCEA. The 10 institutions ranked highest by all respondents in the reputational survey were among the 25 highest producers (see Table 3-23). As in other fields, high producers of educational administration faculty were disproportionately represented among those considered to be of high quality.

Institutions in the North Central region continued to be disproportionately represented among top-ranked programs (Table 7-1) and high-producing programs (Table 3-23). Five of the 10 highest-ranked programs were from this region although only about 28% of the faculty respondents and 24% of the preparation programs were in North Central states. Graduates of programs in the North Central region were disproportionately represented (52%) among faculty at top-ranked institutions (Table 7-6). Although 40% of the faculty respondents and preparation programs were located in the South, only 14% of the faculty at top-rated programs and 27% of all faculty received their doctorates from universities in the South (Table 7-6). However, institutions in the South produced about 29% of the new faculty (those in the first 5 years of their first professorial appointment), second only to programs in the North Central region. Almost two thirds of women faculty received their doctorates from institutions in the Northeast and the North Central regions (Table 7-6).

While the number of institutions preparing all faculty has increased, UCEA-member programs continued to select most of their faculty members from a relatively small number of institutions. In 1964, Shaplin reported that all faculty hired by UCEA programs within the preceding 5 years received doctorates from 37 institutions. Two institutions produced 28% of the faculty; five institutions produced 44% of the new faculty. In 1986, the 48 new faculty appointed at UCEA-member programs had degrees from 32 institutions. Two institutions, Stanford and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, each produced six new faculty, a quarter of the new cohort at UCEA-member institutions. Five institutions produced 40% of the new hires at UCEA programs. Of the seven institutions identified in 1986 as having produced two or more recently hired faculty at UCEA programs (Stanford,

Wisconsin, Ohio State, Chicago, Indiana, Michigan, SUNY-Stony Brook), all but two appeared on the 1964 list of high producing institutions (Shaplin, 1964).

Table 7-6 Distribution of Respondents by Region[a] of the Country from Which They Received Their Doctorate[b]

	Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Minority Respondents		New Faculty Respondents		Top-Ranked Programs		Total	
	N	%[c]	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Northeast	161	15	25	21	14	18	21	13	7	11	186	16
North Central	408	38	50	42	31	41	51	31	33	52	458	39
South	294	28	24	20	18	24	47	29	9	14	318	27
West	199	19	21	17	13	17	44	27	15	23	220	18
Total	1,062	100	120	100	76	100	163	100	64	100	1,182	100

[c]Percentages may not equal 100 because of rounding.
[a]Regional groupings are the same as used in Table 3-9 and in Campbell and Newell (1973).
[b]Reflects only those respondents from U.S. institutions who indicated the institution from which they received their doctorate (N=1,182).

Several of the top-ranked programs in 1986 produced relatively few new faculty. For example, no new faculty members received their doctorates from Harvard, which was ranked high in both the Shaplin study and this study. Illinois, one of the preferred programs in the Shaplin study but not among the top-ranked programs in 1986, and Oregon, ranked high in both 1964 and 1986, each produced only one new faculty member. California-Berkeley, Texas, and Utah produced two new faculty each. While Chicago produced five new faculty, none were women.

Fifteen programs produced 78% (n=50) of the 64 faculty at the top-ranked programs who reported the institution from which they received their doctorate (Table 7-7). Three fifths of the faculty at top-ranked programs received their degrees from nine programs. Except for Claremont, all the institutions from which faculty at top-ranked programs received their degrees were classified as research universities. Eight of the fifteen were among the top-ranked institutions; only six were members of UCEA. Apparently faculty at top-ranked programs come from a relatively small group of institutions. As high-prestige programs exchange graduates, the philosophical and interpretive perspectives with which faculty at prestigious programs view the field may become so homogeneous that an "orthodox" way of identifying, examining, and responding to problems in the field may develop. We will return to this point in the final chapter.

The long-standing practice of recruiting graduates from selected programs has a convincing rationale. According to the higher education folklore, one way institutions can enhance the prestige of their programs is to appoint faculty who have degrees from institutions that occupy a higher position in the status hierarchy than their own institution (Caplow & McGee, 1958). That is, comprehensive institutions try to hire faculty with degrees from research or doctorate-granting institutions;

doctorate-granting programs seek new faculty from research institutions. To maintain or improve their status, research institutions can only recruit from programs at other research institutions that may be perceived as having equal or higher status in the discipline. Thus, the top-rated programs have very few institutions from which to recruit new faculty and may appoint their own graduates who are also perceived by other institutions as highly desirable candidates.

Table 7-7 Institutions Granting Doctorates to Three or More Faculty at Top-Rated Educational Administration Programs

Institutions	# of Faculty (N=64)	% of Total at Top-Ranked Institutions
University of Chicago	8	12.5
University of Wisconsin-Madison	7	10.9
Indiana University	4	6.3
Columbia University	4	6.3
University of Iowa	3	4.7
Michigan State University	3	4.7
The Ohio State University	3	4.7
Stanford University	3	4.7
Syracuse University	3	4.7
University of California-Berkeley	2	3.1
Claremont Graduate School	2	3.1
University of Florida	2	3.1
University of Michigan	2	3.1
Oregon State University	2	3.1
University of Texas	2	3.1

"Inbreeding" (an institution employing its own graduates) is not as widespread now as it was in 1964. In 1986, only 78 faculty members, 6.4% of all respondents, were employed at the institution from which they received the doctorate. Sixty-nine percent (n=54) of those employed by the institution from which they received their

terminal degree were at research institutions, while only 22% (n=17) were employed by doctorate-granting and 9% (n=7) by comprehensive institutions.

Other researchers (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Finkelstein, 1984) have concluded that women across disciplines are disadvantaged because they are not likely to attend prestigious programs. This does not seem to be the case for female educational administration faculty, as 29%, the same percentage as men, received their doctorates from the 14 top-ranked programs and half received their doctorates from UCEA-member institutions. Only a quarter of the male faculty had doctorates from UCEA-member institutions. Similarly, 41% of the minority faculty received their doctorates from the 14 institutions listed in the top 10 by one or more subgroups of nominators (Table 7-1), and 45% of the minority faculty received their degrees from UCEA-member institutions. The strong orientation toward research and scholarly production demonstrated by women and, to a slightly lesser degree, by minority faculty (see Chapter 4) seemed to be a function of the type of program from which faculty received their terminal degrees.

Summary

Indices of quality related to resources, reputation, and outcomes differentiated among educational administration preparation programs. For example, research universities and UCEA-member programs invested more funds in personnel compensation, professional development, and clerical support. Faculty at these institutions also were more research-oriented. Programs with salient reputations were empirically distinguishable from other programs. Top-ranked programs were characterized by: (a) more full-time educational administration faculty, (b) greater research productivity, (c) higher salaries, (d) PhD programs, and (d) more negative tenure decisions. Compared with unranked programs, women faculty were underrepresented at top-ranked programs. Top-ranked program faculty published more than any other subgroup. Even though units that decreased in size were just as likely to be among the top programs in the country as those that have added faculty, the number of faculty at top-ranked programs was almost twice that of faculty at other programs.

Faculty at top-ranked programs were better paid but were not necessarily more satisfied with their jobs or other aspects of the professorial workspace. Indeed, the two best predictors of job satisfaction for all educational administration faculty, salary and the quality of the intellectual climate, were also the best predictors for faculty at the top-ranked programs. However, faculty at top-ranked programs were less likely to be thinking about leaving the academy. Perhaps the best explanation for comparable levels of satisfaction between faculty at top-ranked and unranked programs is that faculty at top-ranked programs have unusually high expectations for their workplace and their own performance. These expectations may be so high that they are impossible to meet in most instances.

The 1986 cohort of educational administration faculty obtained their doctorates from a larger number of institutions than was true in previous decades. However, UCEA-member institutions continued to draw their faculty from a small

group of preparation programs. Production of faculty, particularly those at top-ranked programs, remained concentrated in the North Central region. Relatively few faculty at top-ranked institutions received doctorates from institutions in the South, even though two fifths of the faculty respondents had doctorates from institutions in the South. As in other fields (Conrad & Blackburn, 1986), considerable overlap between top-ranked programs and high-producing programs existed, although to a lesser degree than in 1964.

Notes

1. Higgins (1968) also rated some educational administration doctoral programs as part of a larger study of graduate programs of education.

2. This assumption that faculty are knowledgeable about the quality of programs at other institutions is flawed, of course. Many of the respondents who did not rank-order programs indicated that they were not sufficiently knowledgeable about the quality of programs other than their own or that they lacked criteria on which to base their judgments.

3. The University of Alberta was also a top producer but did not appear in the Carnegie (1987) classification because it is in Canada. However, Alberta meets the research institution criteria established by the Carnegie Foundation and was included in that group for institutional analyses.

❖❖❖ CHAPTER 8 ❖❖❖

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN THE PROFESSORIATE

Continuity and change are the evolutionary rhythms of human systems, including schools and universities. Many characteristics of earlier stages of development are found in later iterations; however, each new stage also exhibits characteristics that are different from those of preceding forms (Bertalanffy, 1968). The educational administration professoriate reflects this pattern. For example, many personal and professional characteristics, activities, and beliefs of the 1986 faculty members resembled those of their 1972 counterparts (Campbell & Newell, 1973). Professors contribute to the continuity of the field by using knowledge of the past to interpret the implications of current and future issues and events (Willower, 1983).

At certain points in the evolution of human systems, however, changes may take place suddenly and often without warning. New forms emerge with qualities which could not have been predicted (Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). Some characteristics of the 1986 faculty cohort and preparation programs were different enough (e.g., more women professors, faculty spending more time in research, fewer full-time faculty) from the 1972 cohort to suggest that the educational administration professoriate is poised on the brink of a new stage of development, a natural reordering, driven by factors peculiar to the professoriate as well as conditions external to educational administration programs and institutions of

higher education. These factors include the public's demand for accountability, increased competition from other social service agencies for governmental support, declining interest in education or the professoriate as a vocation, and changing demographics. To examine this thesis, that the educational administration professoriate is about to undergo a qualitative change, we summarize the major conclusions and implications of our study and offer some speculations about the future of the educational administration professoriate and desirable initiatives for preparation programs.

Conclusions and Implications

The following conclusions are influenced by our perspectives on the field of educational administration. While we are satisfied that each conclusion has empirical foundation, we recognize that others could derive different conclusions from the same information. Indeed, we hope that the detailed presentation of findings in the preceding chapters will permit others to see relationships between findings that we have overlooked or chosen not to emphasize. We invite colleagues to offer plausible, alternative explanations and to draw their own conclusions about the state of the educational administration professoriate in 1986.

A caveat mentioned in Chapter 1 is important enough to reiterate. We made every effort to compile a comprehensive list of institutions which offered graduate programs in educational administration. The number of faculty invited to participate in the 1986 study was greater than the number in 1972, although all evidence indicates that the number of full-time faculty in educational administration has decreased since then. Thus, our initial population likely included a large number of individuals who discarded the questionnaire because they do not identify with educational administration. Nevertheless, our response rate (56%) was average for surveys of this type, so we must acknowledge the potential for bias in the findings and conclusions. This is the bane of all researchers. We cannot claim that we have captured *the truth* about the educational administration professoriate; however, we know much more now about the problems and prospects facing faculty than we did prior to this study.

The data were collected using questionnaires which forced respondents into fixed choices on most items. Thus, our ideas about what is important in educational administration preparation programs and in the professoriate—influenced by those of Campbell and Newell (1973) and approximately 20 colleagues who reviewed the instruments—shaped to a large degree what faculty could report. Semi-structured interviews with faculty would likely have revealed different insights into the educational administration professoriate and, possibly, have led to additional conclusions about the field.

Despite these limitations, we believe that our conclusions and their implications warrant consideration by faculty, academic administrators, and policy makers concerned with the role and responsibilities of the educational administration professoriate. These conclusions were foreshadowed in earlier chapters, but they assume added meaning when presented together and viewed as a whole.

The number of full-time faculty in many educational administration programs has decreased, necessitating a reassessment of the mission of preparation programs and the work scope of faculty.

The contraction in student numbers and financial resources in colleges and schools of education between 1975 and 1985 has taken a toll on educational administration programs. In 1978, programs had an average of about 6.45 faculty (Davis, 1978). In 1986, the average was about five, but the modal number of full-time faculty was only two. Indeed, over half of the educational administration programs had four or fewer faculty, and a quarter had two or fewer faculty. Thus, less than half of the programs had the minimum number of faculty (5) recommended by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). UCEA-member and research institutions had, on the average, twice as many faculty members as programs at other institutions and provided more resources in the form of clerical assistance and funds to support faculty development. Top-ranked programs (based on reputational data) also had more faculty, but the amount of clerical support or professional development funds did not distinguish top-ranked programs from unranked programs.

The declining number of educational administration faculty suggests that the nature and scope of professors' activities should be reconsidered. Can educational administration faculty continue to perform at previous levels of quality in every area with fewer than five faculty, on the average, to cover program maintenance tasks (e.g., recruitment of students, alumni relationships, student advisement), field services, teaching, research, institutional governance, and professional association commitments? Time is a finite commodity. Shrinking resources may also limit opportunities for collaborative research projects and collegial relationships in general—if only because less time will be available for these activities. The expansion of internships in preparation programs has been recommended by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987); but again, faculty time is required to supervise internship experiences appropriately. Perhaps the most important implication of declining departmental size is the retreat from specialization among professors which will probably be necessary. If a department has fewer than five faculty members, the professors are virtually forced to be generalists—with all the advantages and disadvantages associated with this condition. Fragmentation might decrease but so may research and scholarship. The implications of shrinking faculty resources are pervasive and deserve immediate attention in modifying departmental missions and redefining expectations for faculty performance.

The number of female educational administration faculty members has risen sharply, but women continue to be underrepresented and undercompensated.

Although most programs have fewer faculty, female representation has increased significantly. In 1986, women comprised about 12% (departmental data) of educational administration professors compared with only 3% in 1972 (Campbell & Newell, 1973). Female representation in educational administration units,

however, remains substantially below the proportion of women faculty (27%) across disciplines (Carnegie Foundation, 1984).

Since women now constitute half of the doctoral recipients in educational administration and the faculty turnover rate in educational administration units has been high, one might expect female representation to be substantially higher than 12%. Almost one third of faculty members hired from 1976 to 1986 were women, yet turnover among female faculty members seems to be greater than among males. For various reasons, many women do not persist in their faculty role, at least not at the same institution. Department chairpersons reported that more than 300 women were hired from 1976 to 1986 by 297 programs, but only 196 women were employed in these programs in 1986.

The educational administration work environment does not appear conducive to attracting and retaining female faculty members. For example, women were less satisfied with their jobs and collegial relationships at their institutions and were more likely to seek advice from persons outside their institutions. An obvious reason for dissatisfaction was that women, on the average, made $10,000 less than men. Some of the differences in compensation may be attributed to rank, which reflects length of time in the professoriate, and to the type of institution where employed (Tolbert, 1986). For example, compared with men, women were far more likely to be assistant professors and less likely to hold the rank of professor. Only about half of the women were tenured, compared with 84% of the men. The rank and tenure differences were not surprising since women faculty were disproportionately hired within the past decade and had not been in the professoriate long enough to be eligible for tenure or promotion to full rank.

Yet, when gender, rank, and years as a faculty member were controlled, women still earned about $5,000 a year less than their male counterparts, or about 86% of what their male counterparts earned. The gender-related salary disparity is a long-standing condition (Finkelstein, 1984). In the 1940s and 1950s, women's earnings were about 70% of the amount earned by men employed in similar positions. This percentage dropped to 66% in 1960 but returned to 70% in 1970 (Gappa & Uehling, 1979). According to the American Association of University Professors, in 1986-87 women faculty earned 88 cents for every dollar made by men faculty (McMillen, 1987). The gender differential in compensation among educational administration faculty is comparable to the discrepancy across disciplines, a finding that offers little solace.

Lower pay for women across disciplines may be related to gender differences in research productivity, a primary consideration in distributing merit pay (Tuckman, 1979). In general, male faculty members publish more than their female counterparts (Braxton, 1986; Finkelstein, 1984; Ladd & Lipset, 1975). Women faculty in educational administration, however, did not conform to the general pattern. Female educational administration faculty devoted more time to research activities and published more articles, on the average, than did their male counterparts during the preceding 5-year period. Thus, the 1986 data do not support the argument that productivity accounts for gender differences in compensation in the educational administration professoriate.

As female representation increases, greater diversity within the educational administration professoriate can be expected (Kuh & McCarthy, 1980). The nature of preparation programs and administrative practice should change in several ways. Women are more research-oriented, less satisfied with the status quo, more sensitive to the interpersonal dimensions of the work environment, and more likely to form collegial networks beyond their own universities. After reviewing the literature on effective learning environments and gender differences, Shakeshaft (1987) concluded:

> Women [have] clear educational goals, supported by a value system which stresses service, caring, and relationships. Women are focused upon instructional and educational issues .... [Their] communication and decision making styles stress cooperation and help to facilitate a translation of their educational visions into actions. Women monitor and intervene more than men, they evaluate student progress more often, and ... [they] demonstrate, more often than men, the kinds of behavior that promote achievement and learning as well as high morale and commitment...." (p. 200)

An infusion of predominantly female "young turks" may change departmental norms and work environments. The majority of programs currently have only one or two female faculty members. As additional women are appointed, what presently seems to be an inhospitable work environment may also improve. We hope so.

Minority representation in the educational administration professoriate remains woefully low.

From 1972 to 1986 the proportion of minority faculty increased about fourfold, from 2% to 8% (departmental data). Unlike women, however, minorities were not disproportionately represented among faculty hired within the past 5 years. Gender differences persisted within the minority faculty subgroup as 78% of the minority men were tenured compared with only 45% of the minority women. Minority faculty made $5,000 less in academic year salary than Caucasians, perhaps because of high female representation among minority faculty. Compensation for minority and Caucasian males was comparable.

Prospects for increasing minority representation among educational administration faculty ranks are bleak. Although the number of college-age minority persons is increasing, a smaller proportion is going to college (Arbeiter, 1987). The number of black and Hispanic K-12 teachers is also declining. Unlike Caucasian women, minority representation among students in educational administration preparation programs is not increasing. Furthermore, minority group members with graduate degrees in administration are often more attracted by lucrative positions outside academe (McCarthy, 1986). In the absence of incentives, such as fellowships for minority students interested in educational administration, the number of minority faculty will likely decline.

At least half of the educational administration professoriate will be replaced by the year 2000.

The typical faculty member in 1986 was 52 years old, compared with 48 in the 1972 cohort and 48 across disciplines in 1984. If respondents follow through on their expressed intention to retire at an average age of 64, at least half of the current cohort of educational administration faculty will leave the professoriate within the next 10 to 15 years. Educational administration programs will experience greater turnover than predicted for academe in general.

Our field thus has a golden opportunity to rebuild itself, but significant problems cloud the horizon. Most educational administration programs are not currently emphasizing the preparation of professors, and the programs have become more practitioner-oriented since 1972. Also, interest in academic careers among young adults has declined significantly, making it increasingly difficult to attract bright, capable individuals to the professoriate at a time when many vacancies must be filled. The decline in faculty compensation and deteriorating working conditions throughout higher education deter able individuals who have other appealing career options from pursuing academic careers (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Before this situation evolves into a crisis, those currently in faculty positions should plan for the inevitable turnover in the professorship. In recruiting new faculty, considerable attention should be given to diversification in race and gender. Also, experimentation with different types of faculty configurations (e.g., clinical professors, joint appointments with other academic units) could help to revitalize administrative preparation programs. Most alternative staffing patterns, however, are not likely to relieve advising and program maintenance demands. Only regular tenure track faculty can provide such support.

Preparation programs which produce educational administration faculty are no longer concentrated at research institutions.

Little more than half of the 1986 faculty received their doctoral degrees from research institutions. Approximately 185 different universities were mentioned at least once as the doctorate-granting institutions of the 1986 respondents. Clearly, professional preparation is no longer dominated by a small number of prestigious institutions.

Over two fifths of the educational administration faculty respondents in 1986 were employed at comprehensive institutions, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation (1987). Thus, a substantial proportion of faculty were employed by universities that do not have a research mission or emphasize preparation at the doctoral level. This trend reflects a general shift in the distribution of faculty across types of institutions. In 1969, half of all faculty were employed at universities; by 1979, institutions with university status claimed barely one third of the faculty (Clark & Corcoran, 1986).

In 1972, about 43% of the faculty members were employed at institutions affiliated with UCEA in contrast to only 27% of the 1986 faculty cohort. This change can be attributed in part to the facts that there were 10 fewer UCEA institutions in 1986 than in 1972 and that the mean number of faculty members at these institutions has declined (see Campbell et al., 1987, for an analysis of the

decrease in UCEA membership in the 1970s). More significant, however, has been the increase in the number of nonresearch institutions with educational administration programs.

We do not have information that will allow us to compare the quality of instruction across programs at research, doctorate-granting, or comprehensive institutions. We cannot be certain that graduates from UCEA-member programs are better prepared and more effective in solving problems in the field than are graduates from programs not affiliated with UCEA. We feel confident, however, in asserting that the range and depth of material available at programs with richer faculty resources are superior for preparing educational leaders to deal with increasingly complex tasks. In that sense, we support the recommendation of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) that educational administration programs with fewer than five faculty members be closed because they lack adequate faculty resources.

More educational administration faculty members are engaged in research than was true in the past.

Fewer than half of those who participated in the survey conducted by Hills (1965) indicated that they were engaged in research. More educational administration faculty have become involved in research, as over half of the 1986 cohort compared with less than one third of the 1965 group devoted at least 10% of the work week to research.

The interest in research probably reflects more rigorous promotion and tenure standards as well as a commitment—especially on the part of female and younger faculty—to rigorous examination of problems and effective practices in the field. Women were more likely than men to consider research their greatest strength and to spend more time in research and scholarly writing than their male colleagues. Similarly, new faculty (those in the first 5 years of a professorial appointment) were almost twice as likely as their experienced colleagues to indicate that research was their greatest strength. New faculty at UCEA institutions constituted the only subgroup in which a majority did not designate teaching as their primary strength; new faculty at UCEA programs were divided equally between research and teaching as their declared major strength. At UCEA-member programs, new faculty devoted more than a quarter of their time to scholarly activities.

The 1986 faculty cohort, particularly newly hired women, were open to experimenting with different inquiry approaches. Almost three fourths of the faculty (91% of the new female faculty) indicated that graduate programs should emphasize qualitative research techniques or be equally balanced between qualitative and quantitative approaches. Only 7% of the respondents indicated that quantitative approaches should be emphasized.

While faculty in educational administration still spend less time in research (12%) than do faculty in general (18%—Carnegie Foundation, 1984), scholarly productivity seems to be increasing. Of course, more research does not necessarily mean better research. We are keenly interested in enhancing the quality of research produced and are concerned that too many of the questions and problems faculty

investigate fail to engage the interest of practitioners. On balance, however, the fact that more faculty are engaged in inquiry bodes well for the field.

Specialization characterizes the educational administration professoriate. Boyan (1981) has argued that there is no "state of the art in research in educational administration" (p. 6). Rather, the field is comprised of multiple "specialized arts" which reflect their "parent disciplines and allied applied fields" (p. 12). The range of professional journals and associations which the 1986 respondents listed as "primary" suggests that a diverse literature continues to characterize educational administration and that no one professional association represents the majority of educational administration faculty. For example, no single journal was considered the "primary" one for even 30% of the respondents, and no professional association was the first choice of more than 16% of the respondents. Indeed, the disparate set of journals read by respondents may be symptomatic of balkanization of the field (Boyd & Immegart, 1979; Campbell et al., 1987). Another hypothesis is that it reflects a natural movement toward faculty specialization as educational administration faculty identify more closely with subfields (e.g., law, finance, and politics) than with the core discipline. Such specialization characterizes academe in general (Wirt, 1979).

Those who consider inquiry in educational administration as synonymous with organizational studies may lament the growth and visibility of subfields. Indeed, the attention given to subfields could be debilitating, if the micro-analytical perspectives of subfields fail to address fundamental problems facing the field and offer only esoteric expositions of interest to a handful of scholars. Subfields, however, can contribute to interdisciplinary examinations of problems and enrich investigations of school-based phenomena. There are signs that subfields, with their own professional organizations, have achieved a level of legitimacy and are open to collaboration across specialty areas because they no longer feel the need to compete for recognition (McCarthy, 1986).

It is not unreasonable to expect that as the field of educational administration evolves, subfields will become more and more differentiated until a need to integrate their contributions becomes necessary. Without such integration, educational administration will not be able to move to a new, qualitatively different phase of development. In this sense, specialization and differentiation of the educational administration knowledge base (i.e., the legitimation and acceptance of subfields) is a natural phase in the evolution of the field and has broadened perspectives used to understand the dynamics of leadership and management in contemporary schools. Now, however, more scholars must become involved in synthesizing information produced by those working in specialty areas.

Perhaps policy analysis might serve as such an integrative mechanism. Virtually nonexistent prior to World War II, systematic studies of educational policy have the potential to bring theory and practice together to describe, explain, critique, and forecast policy options and to examine the impact of policy decisions on school outcomes (Bolland & Bolland, 1984; McCarthy, 1986; Wirt, 1979). When focused on implementation and the consequences of policy making, educational policy

analysis "provides a unifying nexus for research from different disciplines and fields of study" (Boyd & Immegart, 1979, p. 277). Policy analysis, however, is not a panacea for all the field's problems and challenges. Boyan (1981) noted that while policy analysis holds promise to link specialty areas, its capacity to integrate middle-range theories, such as organizational theory, is limited. Nevertheless, policy analysis has the potential to synthesize and integrate the contributions of educational administration subfields and produce a semblance of a core, unified knowledge base.

Educational administration faculty are satisfied with their present position and career choice.

The best predictor of job satisfaction for educational administration faculty was salary. Therefore, it was not surprising that women (who were paid less) outnumbered men two to one among the 10% of the respondents who voiced dissatisfaction with their jobs. Minority respondents were also less satisfied than their Caucasian colleagues but were still more satisfied than women.

Most faculty in 1986 (84%) would choose to become professors of educational administration again, a slight decrease from 1972 which can be attributed, in part, to the substantial number of women respondents who indicated that they would probably not make this choice again. Women as a group were younger than men, and their views toward academe were consistent with younger faculty in other disciplines. For faculty across disciplines, salary was the most important factor in considering a career change, particularly for women and faculty in junior ranks.

Threats to faculty morale and career satisfaction are matters of more serious concern than they may first appear. Compared with other professional groups with similar amounts of formal education, academics are a breed apart (Finkelstein, 1984). After the glamor of the first few years, physicians, dentists, attorneys, and other professionals often regard their work simply as a means to an end—a respectable way to make a living. Professors, in contrast, usually enjoy their work and are motivated by its inherent satisfactions. They accept lower pay because they like what they do. In this respect, academics are more like craftsmen and skilled artisans in that the boundaries blur between their private and professional lives (Finkelstein, 1984).

The quality of professorial life is threatened by declining opportunities for self-renewal, reduced collegiality and autonomy, and increased institutional and system bureaucracy. Morale has also been adversely affected by the recent period of fiscal austerity. According to Bowen & Schuster (1986), the "financial stringency" has had a debilitating effect on support services, professional travel, and facility renovations, which has "increased the difficulty of faculty tasks and reduced the effectiveness of their efforts" (p. 118). Under these conditions, attracting the finest minds to the professorship—and keeping them there—becomes increasingly difficult. When the intrinsic rewards of a professorial career diminish, dissatisfaction with salary quickly surfaces as a critical career factor. If professors lose a sense of control over their own destinies, they become vulnerable to the economic advantages of competing professions.

Professors are complacent about problems in the academic field of educational administration and about the quality of preparation programs.

As with the 1972 cohort, the 1986 respondents considered few issues to be very serious problems. Only two—the growing regulatory power of states over graduate programs and heavy departmental teaching and advising loads—were viewed as very serious problems by 20% of the 1986 respondents. Female respondents and those hired within the past 5 years were more concerned about the small proportion of minorities and women in the profession than were their male or experienced colleagues. While curriculum reform in preparation programs was ranked the most critical need facing the field, most respondents were quite positive about the caliber of their own preparation programs. Four fifths of the respondents rated their graduate programs as "good" or "excellent." Only 11% regarded their programs as worse than a decade ago. Educational administration faculty, like other professionals, seem to overrate the quality of their own performance.

College professors tend to be liberal by community standards and espouse reforms for various enterprises; but when it comes to changing their own institutions and professional habits, they tend to be conservative and complacent (Boyer, 1987). And since conservative attitudes become more dominant with age, the younger members of the guild are probably the field's best hope for renewal. Even if qualified persons are available, however, the past 2 decades suggest that recreating the professoriate in a different image will not happen automatically.

In fact, a substantial proportion of educational administration faculty members, perhaps as many as half of the current cohort, were hired within the preceding decade. Some attitudes and behaviors of junior faculty were remarkably similar to those of senior colleagues, leading to the conclusion that candidates often are hired who "fit the mold" and are not likely to disturb the status quo. Therefore, recruiting persons with innovative ideas must become a high priority of preparation programs. Where such persons will come from is not clear. An unusual blend of attributes will be required. Selecting a colleague is the most important decision a faculty makes; quality cannot be compromised.

Educational administration faculty members seldom bring recent administrative experience to their professorial role.

Traditionally, educational administration faculty were chastised for grounding their teaching and writing in anecdotes and prescriptions drawn from many years of administrative experience. Yet, almost three fifths of the 1986 respondents were in a university teaching or administrative position for about 5.5 years immediately preceding their current role, and the mean length of time spent in their current role was about 11 years. Less than a quarter of the current cohort joined the faculty ranks directly from a superintendency or other K-12 administrative position. Thus, the criticism that educational administration professors are hired from the ranks of practitioners who teach by recounting their experiences no longer seems valid. Indeed, some believe that the pendulum has swung too far toward scholarship and discipline-based expertise as the most important criterion in selecting faculty.

Black and English (1987) examined 73 advertisements for educational administration faculty positions in 1983-84 and found that five of the most prestigious preparation programs identified by Shaplin (1964) and Sims (1970) did not include the specification, "previous public school administrative experience *required*," in any job announcement. In one case such experience was noted as "desired." Black and English observed that "many of those training school administrators have never been school administrators. The situation would be like trying to train pilots to fly airplanes without ever having really flown one" (p. 131). The position taken by Black and English deserves a thoughtful response. The concern voiced by practitioners that professors are often out of touch with the "real world" of school administration suggests that different types of faculty configurations, such as clinical professorships and adjunct appointments for outstanding practitioners, should receive careful consideration. As mentioned earlier, however, such arrangements will not necessarily lighten the load on regular full-time faculty.

Interest in and time devoted to committee work has declined, making curriculum reform in educational administration less likely.

Faculty participation in committee work, the vehicle for institutional governance and programmatic curriculum reform, declined sharply between 1972 and 1986. More than one third of the 1986 respondents indicated that they spent no time in university committee work and that committee work was their overwhelming choice as the *least* enjoyable aspect of the professorship. The waning interest in committee work has debilitating consequences for the quality of preparation programs.

The professoriate is a privileged role in a privileged organization. Faculty enjoy high status within society and autonomy in the work place. While salaries do not compare favorably with those of the superintendency or private industry, most faculty are able to enjoy a comfortable lifestyle. Professorial perquisites are noteworthy: flexible hours, several extended vacation periods each year, periodic opportunities for self-renewal, and encouragement to seek national and international recognition.

Yet, perquisites can be abused. Many faculty members seem to have abrogated some of the responsibilities associated with autonomy and a professional work setting. One of the peculiar characteristics of the academy is self-governance, for which a high level of faculty involvement is necessary. Self-governance and program maintenance are labor intensive and drain energy away from teaching, research, and field services.

An inverse relationship existed between time spent by 1986 respondents in research and time devoted to other activities such as committee work and program maintenance. This distribution of effort is consistent with the perceived reward system of research universities. Thus, junior faculty are usually advised to avoid university committee work and to spend time in scholarly activities which are more heavily weighted in promotion and tenure decisions.

Satisfaction and rewards are influenced by socialization, expectations, and behavior. Faculty responsible for preparing the next generation of educational

administration leaders must begin to attend to elements of the graduate school experience often considered trivial and insignificant compared with the transmission of information and acquisition of inquiry skills. Educational administration professors must become more involved in nurturing a strong academic culture—one that encourages experimentation, reflection, and tolerance of diversity. Such a culture also requires attention to numerous maintenance activities (recruiting students, evaluating curricular experiences, revising advisement practices, maintaining systematic contacts with alumni, supervising clerical staff), activities which productive faculty do not view as rewarding or satisfying.

If universities want to enhance program quality, the preordinate value they place on research must be reconsidered. Admittedly, we need more research to learn how school administrators can improve the quality of teaching and learning. Yet the diminution of enthusiasm for activities such as committee work may pose a greater threat to improving educational leadership programs than do gaps in the knowledge base.

The most pressing need in the field, according to the 1986 respondents, was curriculum reform in educational administration preparation programs. But most faculty spent little or no time in collective efforts to modify curriculum. This does not mean that courses are not periodically revised or that reading lists are not updated. Such efforts, while important and necessary, are essentially autonomous acts, independent of other program elements.

Critics have charged that the educational administration curriculum has remained essentially unchanged for decades. This is not surprising since educational administration preparation programs are bastions of conservatism in tolerant but risk-aversive universities. Gibboney (1987) lamented that even blue-ribbon panels, such as the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987), seem destined to simply tinker with, rather than recommend a fundamental restructuring of, a curriculum grounded in management and business administration principles. If Gibboney's interpretation is accurate (i.e., preparation programs emphasize school management at the expense of understanding education and scholarship), nothing less than a fundamental reordering of what is covered in graduate programs can respond to the current crisis in educational leadership. Only group action can reorganize training programs to the magnitude necessary to respond to the challenges facing the field. Systemic curriculum revision demands a level of commitment and effort from faculty members that they do not presently seem prepared to give.

In light of the many duties professors are expected to perform, allocating effort to new priorities cannot be legislated nor will it come without costs. Trade-offs must be anticipated and choices made. For example, some faculty must devote more effort to program development and institutional governance. A simple solution would be to assign underutilized faculty (those who expend relatively little effort in service or research activities) the responsibility for program maintenance and curriculum revision. Unfortunately, underutilized faculty often do not have the creativity and energy needed for these crucial tasks.

The importance of a strong department chairperson or program coordinator to the success of curriculum reform cannot be overstated. Faculty are understandably concerned that efforts directed toward curriculum reform will not be weighted as much as a publication or prestigious professional association appointment in performance reviews linked to salary increases or promotion. Through his or her actions, the department chairperson must demonstrate commitment to the university and to the field and negotiate appropriate variances in the institutional reward system so that curriculum restructuring can be designed and implemented.

Some will argue that a revised, "standard" curriculum should be adopted by all training programs in a state or by members of a consortium, such as UCEA. A "single best curriculum" (Cooper & Boyd, 1987) has dominated the preparation of school administrators for decades. With the increasing specificity of state certification controls, we must be wary of exchanging one orthodoxy for another. Multiple approaches to preparing educational leaders are needed now. A key strategy in curriculum reform will be negotiating relief from constraining state certification and licensure requirements that force preparation programs into a lock-step curriculum which may not reflect needs and concerns of the field. A climate of experimentation must be created and maintained in university-based preparation programs, state departments of education, and professional associations, if alternative preparation models are to be developed. Partnerships between preparation programs and private industries that have demonstrated effective models of leadership training merit consideration. Caution must be exercised in adopting corporate strategies, however, as some techniques that work in for-profit firms may not be appropriate in nonprofit, service organizations.

Quality rankings of preparation programs reflect institutional prestige and scholarly productivity rather than excellence in the preparation of educational leaders.

Quality is an elusive, context-dependent notion, a relative judgment at best. Nevertheless, the same factors that have been correlated with departmental rankings of quality in other fields also distinguished top-ranked educational administration preparation programs from unranked programs. Top-ranked programs had more full-time faculty who published more, were located at prestigious research institutions, and were usually among the highest producers of educational administration faculty. The average teaching load at top-ranked programs was modest compared with the load at comprehensive universities where the majority of faculty were employed. Indeed, top-ranked programs had many of the characteristics which, according to Baird (1986), contribute to an almost "ideal" graduate research department: faculty with degrees from highly respected programs, talented students committed to scholarship, a commitment on the part of the faculty and administration to train researchers, and the allocation of resources required to sustain an active research program.

The list of top-ranked, prestigious preparation programs has not changed significantly since the early 1960s. Like other fields, once a reputation has been attained (either outstanding or mediocre), it is difficult to change. Campbell's and

Newell's (1973) description of prestigious programs is still valid: "These universities have strong financial support, they are centers for graduate and professional training, and they have distinguished faculty members in education and in the basic disciplines" (p. 138).

As with other reputational studies of departmental quality (Conrad & Blackburn, 1986), an institutional halo effect operates, which favors educational administration programs located at institutions with particularly strong reputations. Such reputations, while merited, are related more to their track records in obtaining research and development funds from the federal government and corporate or philanthropic sponsors than to their production of outstanding educational leaders. We cannot claim that the factors related to salient reputations for knowledge production are also associated with high-quality preparation of school administrators. We did not collect information to estimate the quality of teaching and learning that takes place in educational administration programs. Nor did we assess the quality of the service provided by faculty when they consult with school corporations or professional associations. Making such judgments requires data from multiple measures, including interviews and observations.

We do not wish to diminish the contributions of top-ranked programs to the field of educational administration. A cadre of distinctive preparation programs is an important symbol of excellence for the field. However, the extent to which the prestigious programs recruit one another's graduates (driven by the requirement that new faculty have degrees from peer institutions or those with higher status in the field) virtually ensures that a small group of programs exerts an inordinate amount of influence on ideas that gain currency among educational administration faculty. We do not know the extent to which the inbreeding of philosophical perspectives and ideas has constrained the generation of innovative approaches in preparing the next generation of educational leaders, but we are concerned about this issue.

As recommended by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987), a National Policy Board on Educational Administration has been established. Seven professional associations are charter members of this board that will work toward the improvement of educational administration as a profession. This board could be charged with conducting periodic reviews of preparation programs and recommending quality standards for preparing school administrators. Value-added measures of educational administration programs need to be developed and supported by professional associations (Silver, 1983). Perhaps variations on the assessment center concept (Hersey, 1977; Smith, 1984) could be used to screen candidates entering administrative preparation programs and to assess competencies upon program completion. These data may illuminate how much educational leadership programs contribute to students' ability to make informed judgments and to generate alternative approaches to solving problems in the field.

A Final Word

We suggested earlier that the educational administration professoriate may be on the brink of a new, qualitatively different phase of development. The conclusions from this study indicate that this is the case.

Preparation programs are smaller now than in 1972 and must rely—for the next few years—on an aging professoriate to meet the multiple responsibilities which, through accretion, have almost paralyzed curriculum reform efforts. New faculty, many of whom are women, are more research-oriented and are quite enthusiastic about qualitative methods and research grounded in the experience of practitioners. Subfields are thriving, which makes for a highly differentiated field of study and practice. The theory movement, once heralded as a unifying paradigm for the field, has been supplanted by an openness to alternative inquiry approaches that reject positivist assumptions to explain complex school phenomena.

Campbell et al. (1987) suggested that preparation programs:

> . . . have oscillated between "preparing the person" and "preparing for the role." In the first case, the candidate is especially encouraged to develop his or her intellectual capacities, educational philosophy, and cultural awareness. Knowledge and self-understanding are primary. In the other case, the emphasis is on shaping the individual to fit the role or roles he or she is preparing to assume. Here the chief purpose is to help the student understand the job and the institution and to acquire the skills necessary to serve the institution and meet the requirements of the position. (p. 171)

We perceive that conditions now demand preparation programs to emphasize "preparing the person." Certainly, the complexity of educational environments requires managers with sufficient technical knowledge in areas such as finance and law. But schools also need leaders with vision and compassion grounded in moral conviction to cope with the rapidity of social and technological change (Gardner, 1986).

We cannot predict with any degree of specificity how faculty activities and attitudes in the next phase in the evolution of the educational administration professoriate will differ from those of the current faculty cohort. However, we are confident that an influx of new faculty coupled with different approaches to problem identification and research methods will alter dramatically the nature of many educational administration programs.

Numerous challenges face the field of educational administration. The role of the educational leader must be redefined. The educational administration curriculum requires fundamental reorganization, a transformation. Preparation programs must develop the capacity to produce hundreds of new faculty and thousands of school administrators who will be needed in the next decade. It is tempting to offer a shopping list of actions that various groups should take to help preparation programs realize their potential and provide the leadership needed in schools today. We will resist this temptation but encourage others to join in the dialogue and work on one or more of the many agenda items mentioned in this and earlier chapters.

The next decade presents an unprecedented opportunity to change the nature of preparation in educational administration, if faculty can be recruited who have new, perhaps even radical, ideas about how to define and respond to problems in schools and in the professoriate. It remains to be seen, however, if schools and colleges of education and the field of educational administration can move beyond rhetoric to action. Although many groups have a stake in the preparation of educational leaders, in the final analysis, faculty members are responsible and should be held accountable for the quality of administrative preparation programs. While we can seek support and learn much from many quarters, only the educational administration professoriate can create the curricular revolution needed to reform educational leadership in America. The findings from this study provide some insight into the group from which the reformers are likely to come.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. (1987). The annual report on the economic status of the profession 1986-1987. *Academe*, *73*(2), 3-79.

Arbeiter, S. (1987). Black enrollments: The case of missing students. *Change*, *19*(3), 14-19.

Austin, A. E., & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Baird L. L. (1986). What characterizes a productive research environment? *Research in Higher Education*, *25*, 211-225.

Baldwin, R. (1979). *Adult and career development: What are the implications for faculty?* (Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 2). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1983). The condition of the professoriate: The variables and the data bases. In R. Baldwin & R. Blackburn (Eds.), *College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint* (pp 15-28) (New Directions in Institutional Research, No. 40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bayer, A. E. (1973). *Teaching faculty in academe: 1972-73*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory* (rev. ed.). New York: Braziller.

Black, J. A., & English, S. W. (1986). *What they don't tell you in schools of education about school administration*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Blackburn, R. T., Behymer, C. E., & Hall, D. E. (1978). Research note: Correlates of faculty publications. *Sociology of Education*, *51*, 132-141.

Bolland, J. W., & Bolland, K. A. (1984). Program evaluation and policy analysis: Toward a new synthesis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *6*, 333-340.

Bowen, H., & Schuster, J. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyan, N. (1981). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Researcher, 10*(2), 6-13.

Boyd, W. L., & Immegart, G. L. (1979). Education's turbulent environment and problem finding: Lines of congruence. In G. Immegart & W. Boyd (Eds.), *Problem finding in educational administration: Trends in research and theory* (pp. 275-289). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America* (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching). New York: Harper & Row.

Braxton, J. M. (1986). The normative structure of science: Social control in the academic profession. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 309-357). New York: Agathon.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1980). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis.* London: Heinemann.

Campbell, R. F. (1981). *The making of a professor.* Salt Lake City: Publishers Press for Roald F. Campbell.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Campbell, R. F., & Newell, L. J. (1973). *A study of professors of educational administration.* Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Caplow, T., & McGee, R. J. (1958). *The academic marketplace.* New York: Basic Books.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1977). *Missions of the college curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1984). *Technical report: 1984 Carnegie Foundation national surveys of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Opinion Research Corp.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1985). The faculty: Deeply troubled. *Change, 17*(4), 31-34.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). *A classification of institutions of higher education* (rev. ed.). Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cartter, A. A. (1966). *An assessment of quality in graduate education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty culture. In T. R. Lunsford (Ed.), *The study of campus cultures* (pp. 39-54). Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.

Clark, D. L. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.), *Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution* (pp. 43-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Clark, M. J. (1976). The meaning of quality in graduate and professional education. In J. Katz & R. Hartnett (Eds.), *Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students* (pp. 85-104). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of cumulative disadvantage. *Journal of Higher Education, 57*, 20-43.

Conrad, C. F., & Blackburn, R. T. (1985). Program quality in higher education: A review and critique of the literature. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 283-308). New York: Agathon.

Conrad, C. F., & Blackburn, R. T. (1986). Current views of department quality: An empirical examination. *Review of Higher Education, 9*, 249-266.

Conrad, C. F., & Wilson, R. F. (1985). *Academic program review: Institutional approaches, expectations, and controversies* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 5). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Cooper, B., & Boyd, W. (1987). The evolution of training for school administration. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Approaches to administrative training in education* (pp. 3-27). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Corson, J. J. (1969). *Governance of colleges and universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 30*, 116-127.

Culbertson, J. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3-26). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Davis, W. (1978). Departments of educational administration. In P. Silver & D. Spuck (Eds.), *Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States* (pp. 23-52). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Digest of Education Statistics 1985-1986. (1986). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education.

Farquhar, R. (1977). Preparatory programs in educational administration, 1954 - 1974. In L. Cunningham, W. Hack, & R. Nystrand (Eds.), *Educational administration: The developing decades* (pp. 329-357). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Finkelstein, M. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.

Frances, C. (1985). 1986: Major trends shaping the outlook for higher education. *AAHE Bulletin, 38*(4), 3-7.

Gappa, J. M., & Uehling, B. S. (1979). *Women in academe: Steps to greater equality* (Research Report No. 1). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Gardner, J. W. (1986). *The tasks of leadership* (Leadership Papers No. 2). Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Gibboney, R. A. (1987, April 15). Education of administrators: 'An American Tragedy'. *Education Week*, p. 28.

Goldstein, A. J. (Ed.). (1986). *Peterson's annual guide: Graduate and professional programs*. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Annual Guides.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957-1958). Cosmopolitans and locals. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 2*, 281-306, 444-480.

Greenfield, T. B. (1980). The man who comes back through the door in the wall: Discovering truth, discovering self, discovering organizations. *Educational*

Administration Quarterly, 16 (3), 26-59.

Griffiths, D. E. (1983). Evolution in theory and research: A study of prominent researchers. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 19* (3), 201-221.

Halpin, A. W., & Hayes, A. E. (1977). The broken ikon: Or, whatever happened to theory? In L. Cunningham, W. Hack, & R. Nystrand (Eds.), *Educational administration: The developing decades* (pp. 261-297). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Hersey, P. W. (1977). NASSP's assessment center—from concept to practice. *NASSP Bulletin, 61*, 74-76.

Higgins, A. S. (1968). *The rating of selected fields of doctoral study in the graduate schools of education: An opinion survey.* Unpublished EdD dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Hills, J. (1965). Educational administration: A field in transition. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 1*(1), 58-66.

Hoy, W. K. (1982). Recent developments in theory and research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18* (3), 1-11.

Hunter, D. E., & Kuh, G. D. (1987). The "Write Wing": Characteristics of prolific contributors to the higher education literature. *Journal of Higher Education, 58*, 443-462.

Kuh, G. D. (1981). *Indices of quality in the undergraduate experience* (AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 4). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Kuh, G. D., & McCarthy, M. M. (1980). Research orientation of doctoral students in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 16*(2), 101-121.

Ladd, E. C. (1979). *The work experience of American college professors: Some data and an argument* (Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 2). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Ladd, E., & Lipset, S. (1973). *Professors, unions, and American higher education.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Ladd, E., & Lipset, S. (1975). *The divided academy: Professors and politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lawrence, J. K., & Green, K. C. (1980). *A question of quality: The higher education ratings game* (AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 5). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Lilley, E. (1986). *Educational administration directory, 1985-86.* Morgantown, WV: University of West Virginia.

Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Lutz, F. W., & Dow, T. G. (1981). National departmental recognition in programs of educational administration. *Planning and Changing, 12*(1), 54-62.

Mayer, M. (1974). Everything is shrinking in higher education. *Fortune, 90*, 122-125.

McCarthy, M. M. (1986). Research in educational administration: Promising signs for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 22*(3), 3-20.

McCarthy, M. M. (1987). The professoriate in educational administration: Current status and challenges ahead. *UCEA Review, 28*(2), 2-6.

McKeachie, W. J. (1983). Faculty as a renewable resource. In R. Baldwin & R. Blackburn (Eds.), *College faculty: Versatile human resources in a period of constraint* (pp. 57-66) (New Directions in Institutional Research, No. 40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McMillen, L. (1987, July 15). Woman professors pressing to close salary gap; Some colleges adjust pay, others face lawsuits. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 33*(44), pp. 1, 14.

Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*, 123-144.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure.* New York: Free Press.

Miklos, E. (1983). Evolution in administrator preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 19* (3), 153-177.

Mitroff, I. I., & Kilmann, R. H. (1978). *Methodological approaches to social science: Integrating divergent concepts and theories.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Molotsky, I. (1986). Help wanted: 130,000 new faculty members. *AAUP Footnotes*, *4*(2), 1, 3.

Moore, H. A. (1964). The ferment in school administration. *1964 NSSE Yearbook*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, D. A., & Newell, L. J. (1982). Professors of community college education: Changes in theoretical and professional orientations. *Community/Junior College Quarterly*, *7*, 15-29.

Murphy, M. (1984, October 18). *Some comments about the state of educational administration*. UCEA Presidential Address, Indianapolis.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's Schools*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

National Education Association. (1979). *Higher education faculty: Characteristics and opinions*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National Science Foundation. (1981). *Activities of science and engineering faculty in universities and 4-year colleges: 1978/79*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Neustadt, R. E., & May, E. R. (1986). *Thinking in time: The uses of history for decision-makers*. New York: Free Press.

Newell, L. J., & Morgan, D. A. (1980). [Study of professors of higher education and educational administration]. Unpublished data.

Newell, L. J., & Morgan, D. A. (1983). The evolving higher education professoriate: Implications for ASHE. *Review of Higher Education*, *7*(1), 67-83.

Pelz, D. C., & Andrews, F. M. (1976). *Scientists in organizations* (rev. ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Peterson, K., & Finn, C. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest 79*, 42-62.

Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of chaos*. New York: Bantam.

Schorr, M., & Hoogstra, L. (1984). *Directory of higher education: Programs and faculty* (5th ed). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education & ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Schuster, J., & Bowen, H. (1985). The faculty at risk. *Change, 17*(4), 12-21.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). *Women in educational administration*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Shaplin, J. T. (1964). The professorship in educational administration: Attracting talented personnel. In D. J. Willower & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *The professorship in educational administration* (pp. 1-14). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration and College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Silver, P. F. (1983). *Professionalism in educational administration*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Silver, P. F., & Spuck, D. W. (Eds.). (1978). *Preparatory programs for educational administrators in the United States*. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Sims, P. D. (1970). *Assessment of the quality of graduate departments of educational administration*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Smith, C. F. (1984, April). The use of the National Association of Secondary School Principals' (NASSP) assessment center reports: A preliminary analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Smith, R., & Fiedler, F. E. (1971). The measurement of scholarly work: A critical review of the literature. *Educational Record, 52*, 225-232.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Gregory, M. W. (1987). Faculty stress: The tension between career demands and "having it all." In P. Seldin (Ed.), *Coping with faculty stress* (pp. 43-52) (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stedman, J. & Jordan, K. F. (1986). *Education reform reports: Content and impact* (Report No. 86-56 EPW). Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Tatsuoka, M. M. (1981). *Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research*. London: Wiley.

Tolbert, P. S. (1986). Organizations and inequality: Sources of earnings differentials between male and female faculty. *Sociology of Education, 59*, 227-235.

Tuckman, H. P. (1979). The academic reward structure in higher education. In D. Lewis & W. Becker, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic rewards in higher education* (pp. 165-190). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Webster, D. S. (1981). Advantages and disadvantages of methods of assessing quality. *Change, 13*(7), 20-24.

Webster, D. S. (1985). Institutional effectiveness using scholarly peer assessments as major criteria. *Review of Higher Education, 9*, 67-82.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 1-18.

Willower, D. J., & Culbertson, J. (Eds.). (1964). *The professorship in educational administration.* Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration and College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Willower, D. J. (1983). Evolution in the professorship: Past, philosophy, future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 19*(3), 179-200.

Wirt, F. M. (1979). The uses of political science in the study of educational administration. In G. Immegart & W. Boyd (Eds.), *Problem finding in educational administration: Trends in research and theory* (pp. 145-148). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Yuker, H. E. (1984). *Faculty workload: Research, theory, and interpretation* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Appendix A

THE PROFESSORSHIP IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
1986

DIRECTIONS: Please check (√) or write a response in the space provided.

Part I
Professional Data

1. What is your academic rank?

a. Professor _____
b. Associate professor _____
c. Assistant professor _____
d. Instructor _____
e. Other (specify) _____

2. If you are a tenured faculty member, please indicate how long since tenure was granted. _____

3. If you are assigned part-time to educational administration, what portion of your time does this assignment represent?

a. 1/4 time _____
b. 1/3 time _____
c. 1/2 time _____
d. 2/3 time _____
e. 3/4 time _____
f. Does not apply _____

4. If you hold an administrative appointment concurrent with your faculty appointment, please indicate your title.

a. Department chair _____
b. College/school assistant or associate dean _____
c. College/school dean _____
d. Other (specify) _____

5. In which level of administration do you have primary expertise as a professor?

a. Educational administration (K-12) _____
b. Community college administration _____
c. Higher education administration _____
d. Other (specify) _____

6. Place a "1" by your primary area of specialization and a "2" by your secondary area (if applicable).

a. Academic or program administration _____
b. Curriculum _____
c. Economics and finance _____
d. Institutional research _____
e. Law _____
f. Organizational theory _____
g. Personnel management _____
h. Collective bargaining _____
i. Policy studies _____
j. Research methodology _____
k. Social, historical or philosophical issues _____
l. Student personnel _____
m. Principalship _____
n. Community education _____
o. School-community relations _____
p. Other (specify) _____

7. What is your current academic year salary?

a. Less than $20,000 _____
b. $20,000-$24,999 _____
c. $25,000-$29,999 _____
d. $30,000-$34,999 _____
e. $35,000-$39,999 _____
f. $40,000-$44,999 _____
g. $45,000-$49,999 _____
h. $50,000-$54,999 _____
i. $55,000 or more _____

8. How much income did you receive last year from summer school teaching or "overload" arrangements with your university?

a. None _____
b. Some, but less than $2,000 _____
c. $2,000-$3,999 _____
d. $4,000-$5,999 _____
e. $6,000-$7,999 _____
f. $8,000-$9,999 _____
g. $10,000-$11,999 _____
h. $12,000-$13,999 _____
i. $14,000 or more _____

9. How much external income did you receive last year from such sources as royalties, guest lectures, consulting, and private contracts?

a. None _____
b. Some, but less than $2,000 _____
c. $2,000-$3,999 _____
d. $4,000-$5,999 _____
e. $6,000-$7,999 _____
f. $8,000-$9,999 _____
g. $10,000-$11,999 _____
h. $12,000-$13,999 _____
i. $14,000 or more _____

10. Indicate approximately how many days per month you devote in a typical year to each of the following activities.

a. Consulting ____
b. Attending professional meetings ____
c. Guest lecturing ____
d. Editing journals ____

11. How many credit hours do you teach in a typical term? ____ (Indicate quarter ____ or semester ____ plan).

12. What proportion of your university time do you spend in each of the activities described below? (Indicate to the nearest 5%; total should be 100%).

a. Teaching and advising undergraduate students ____
b. Teaching and advising graduate students ____
c. Supervising doctoral work ____
d. Research and writing ____
e. Consulting/field activities ____
f. Committee work and faculty governance activities ____
g. University administration ____
h. Other (specify) ____

13. Indicate approximately how many times in the last three years you have taught a course in each of the areas listed below.

a. Community college administration ____
b. Education law ____
c. Personnel management ____
d. Education finance ____
e. Governance of higher education ____
f. Introduction to administration (K-12) ____
g. Student personnel ____
h. Administration in colleges and universities ____
i. Organizational theory ____
j. Planning in education ____
k. Politics of education ____
l. Research methods ____
m. School-community relations ____
n. Supervision of instruction ____
o. Other (specify) ____

14. In the last three years:

a. How many doctoral dissertation committees have you chaired? ____
b. How many doctoral dissertation committees have you served on as a member? ____
c. How many Ed.S. committees have you chaired? ____
d. How many master's degree committees have you chaired? ____

15. How many books or monographs have you written or edited in your career? ____

16. How many professional articles, scholarly papers or book chapters have you written or co-authored in the last five years? ____

17. Are you currently receiving external funds or release time for research or development activities? ____ If yes, please indicate type of research and source of funding.

Title of project	Source of funds

18. Please list in order of their importance to you the professional journals you read most often (maximum of three).

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

19. Do you subscribe to the following UCEA journals? (Check all that apply.)

a. *Educational Administration Quarterly* ____
b. *Educational Administration Abstracts* ____
c. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership* ____

20. What are the national professional associations to which you belong? (List a maximum of three that are the most important to you.) What offices have you held in these associations in the last five years?

Name of association	Office(s) held	Year(s)

21. Approximately how many professional meetings or conferences did you attend in 1985 at which you were a speaker? ____

Part II
Opinion Survey

22. Please rank the three factors that most influenced your decision to enter the professorship.

a. The professors in your doctoral program _____
b. An interest in ideas and the extension of knowledge _____
c. The relative freedom and independence of professors _____
d. An interest in students and teaching _____
e. The prestige or social status that professors enjoy
f. Other (specify) _____

23. If you had it to do over again, would you still be a professor of educational administration? yes _____ no _____
If "no," what might you have preferred to do? _____

24. For each of the items listed below, indicate your level of satisfaction: (1) very satisfied; (2) satisfied; (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; (4) dissatisfied; (5) very dissatisfied. Circle the appropriate number.

a. Present position 1 2 3 4 5
b. Current salary 1 2 3 4 5
c. Caliber of graduate students 1 2 3 4 5
d. Caliber of departmental colleagues 1 2 3 4 5
e. Structure of department to which you are assigned 1 2 3 4 5
f. Emphasis on research 1 2 3 4 5

25. Please rank the following with one (1) being your area of primary strength.

a. Teaching _____
b. Research _____
c. Service _____

26. What is the current orientation of the graduate program in your department and how would you prefer the program to be oriented? (Check one in each column.)

	Current	Preference
a. More towards preparing practitioners		
b. More towards preparing professors and researchers		
c. About equally balanced between the two		

27. In preparing students to conduct research, what is the current emphasis in your department and what emphasis would you prefer? (Check one in each column.)

	Current	Preference
a. More emphasis on qualitative approaches in conducting research		
b. More emphasis on quantitative approaches in conducting research		
c. Equal emphasis on quantitative and qualitative research approaches		
d. Research is not emphasized		

28. From whom do you typically seek advice related to serious professional concerns? (Mark only one.)

a. A colleague in your department _____
b. A colleague in your univ., but not in your dept. _____
c. A colleague at another university _____
d. An administrator _____
e. A family member _____
f. Other (specify) _____

29. Place an "M" by the single aspect of the professorship you most enjoy, and an "L" by the single aspect you least enjoy.

a. Teaching and advising undergraduate students _____
b. Teaching and advising graduate students _____
c. Supervising doctoral work _____
d. Research and writing _____
e. Consulting/field activities
f. Committee work and faculty governance activities
g. Directing programs/projects
h. Other (specify) _____

30. Please rank the three factors that would most likely influence you to consider changing your present position.

a. More stimulating colleagues _____
b. A significant increase in salary _____
c. More able students _____
d. More support for research activities _____
e. More opportunities to participate in field service projects
f. A promotion in academic rank _____
g. A more attractive geographical area or community _____
h. Other (specify) _____

31. Please rank the three most critical needs in our academic field.

a. More able students _____
b. A more extensive knowledge base _____
c. More attention to practical problems _____
d. More emphasis on research _____
e. Curriculum reform in preparation programs _____
f. Faculty with expertise in fields other than education _____
g. External support for research and development activities
h. Closer ties with practitioners _____
i. Other (specify) _____

32. To what extent do you consider each of the following to be a problem in our profession? Circle the number corresponding to your belief: (1) very serious problem; (2) rather serious; (3) moderately serious; (4) no problem.

a. Lack of university support for my department relative to other departments in my institution	1	2	3	4
b. Difficulty in placing students in administrative positions	1	2	3	4
c. Difficulty in placing students in professorships	1	2	3	4
d. The heavy teaching and advising load in my department	1	2	3	4
e. Pressure to publish scholarly work	1	2	3	4
f. Pressure to submit proposals and acquire external funding for my research	1	2	3	4
g. Lack of able students	1	2	3	4
h. The low level of salaries in my department	1	2	3	4
i. The poor intellectual climate in my department	1	2	3	4
j. The inferior quality of discourse at professional and scholarly meetings I attend	1	2	3	4
k. Lack of appropriate competency standards for students in graduate programs	1	2	3	4
l. Professors spending too much time in private consulting	1	2	3	4
m. The small proportion of women and persons from minority groups in our profession	1	2	3	4
n. Growing regulatory powers of states in graduate programs in our field	1	2	3	4
o. Residency requirements that result in declining enrollments	1	2	3	4
p. Increase in off-campus teaching assignments	1	2	3	4
q. The "politics" of academic life	1	2	3	4
r. Quality faculty leaving for positions outside of academe	1	2	3	4
s. Lack of collegueship in my department	1	2	3	4
t. The rising average age of professors	1	2	3	4

33. How do you rate the quality of the educational administration preparation program at your institution?

a. Excellent ____
b. Good ____
c. Fair ____
d. Poor ____

34. Compared with ten years ago, the quality of the educational administration preparation program at your institution is:

a. Much better ____
b. Somewhat better ____
c. About the same ____
d. Worse ____
e. Much worse ____

35. For each of the statements below, indicate whether you (1) strongly agree; (2) tend to agree; (3) neither agree nor disagree; (4) tend to disagree; or (5) strongly disagree. Circle the appropriate number.

a. Quality teaching and research are interdependent	1	2	3	4	5
b. More of the literature in educational administration should be theory based	1	2	3	4	5
c. Faculty should be centrally involved in university governance and decision making	1	2	3	4	5
d. I would like to have more contact with professors at other universities	1	2	3	4	5
e. My university should be more explicit about the criteria used in making promotion and tenure decisions	1	2	3	4	5
f. Former practitioners make the best professors of educational administration	1	2	3	4	5
g. Scholars with specialized training in a related discipline make the best professors in our field	1	2	3	4	5
h. Faculty should be more concerned about the well-being of their own universities	1	2	3	4	5
i. Faculty should participate extensively in scholarly and professional meetings	1	2	3	4	5
j. Increased emphasis on the general practice of administration would greatly enhance my field	1	2	3	4	5
k. I am likely to leave academe for other employment	1	2	3	4	5
l. The practice of granting professorial tenure should be abolished in higher education	1	2	3	4	5
m. Excellence in teaching and research are seldom exhibited by the same individual	1	2	3	4	5
n. Faculty should have fewer committee assignments and other administrative or quasi-administrative tasks	1	2	3	4	5
o. Increased emphasis on qualitative research methods would strengthen inquiry in educational administration	1	2	3	4	5
p. Academic standards for admission to graduate study at my institution should be higher	1	2	3	4	5
q. Academic standards for graduation at the doctoral level at my institution should be higher	1	2	3	4	5
r. Greater attention to field studies would strengthen practice	1	2	3	4	5
s. Students should be required to complete a residency requirement to earn a doctorate	1	2	3	4	5

36. Please rank the five institutions you consider to have the best educational administration programs.

1st _____
2nd _____
3rd _____
4th _____
5th _____

37. What are the substantive areas in educational administration that should receive more emphasis in research or teaching?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Part III
Personal Background

38. Sex:
    a. Male _____ b. Female _____

39. Marital status:

    a. Single _____ b. Married _____

40. Race:

    a. American Indian _____ d. Caucasian _____
    b. Asian _____ e. Hispanic _____
    c. Black _____ f. Other _____

41. Place an "M" by the occupation of your mother and an "F" by the occupation of your father.

    a. Professional _____ e. Unskilled laborer _____
    b. Managerial _____ f. Not employed _____
    c. Skilled laborer _____ g. Other (specify) _____
    d. Semi-skilled laborer _____

42. Please provide the following information about your academic preparation.

Degree	Year	University	Major Field

43. Please indicate your age at each of the following stages in your career. (Omit any that do not apply.)

    1. Began work on doctorate _____ 4. Present age _____
    2. Received doctorate _____ 5. Age at which you plan to retire _____
    3. Entered professorship _____

44. Please provide the following information about the professional positions you have held including military service. (List most recent first.)

Date	Title or Rank	Name of Institution

45. If there is any additional information you would like to include or if you have any comments or suggestions concerning this study, we welcome your remarks. Please attach one or more additional sheets if necessary.

Please return this questionnaire to:

Carla M. Iacona
Room 241, School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
Phone: (812) 335-7454

Appendix B

The Professorship in Educational Administration
Departmental Data

Directions: Please provide the following information about your department and return form to Carla M. Iacona, Education 241, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

1. What is the title of the department to which educational administration faculty are assigned? _____

2. Has the title of this department been changed within the past ten years? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, what was the previous title(s)? _____

3. How many full-time faculty members consider their primary assignment to be educational administration? Please reflect the composition of the faculty on the table below.

	White Male	White Female	Minority Male	Minority Female
Professor (tenured)				
Professor (nontenured)				
Associate professor (tenured)				
Associate professor (nontenured)				
Assistant professor (tenured)				
Assistant professor (nontenured)				

4. Of the faculty members hired in your department during the past ten years, how many were:

   a. White males _____
   b. White females _____
   c. Minority males _____
   d. Minority females _____

5. Compared with ten years ago, the educational administration faculty has:

   a. Increased by (specify number) _____
   b. Decreased by (specify number) _____
   c. Remained stable _____

6. How many faculty members from your department have been denied tenure in the past ten years? _____

7. In which educational administration specialties does your institution offer graduate degrees? (Check all that apply).

	Ph.D.	Ed.D.	Ed.S.	Master's
a. Educational administration (K-12)				
b. Community college administration				
c. Higher education administration				
d. Special education administration				
e. Other (please specify)				

8. What is the annual amount of support for professional development (e.g., travel to professional meetings) per faculty member in your department? $_____

9. What is the faculty/secretary ratio in your department? _____

10. Has the department to which educational administration faculty are assigned been reorganized within the past ten years? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please describe on back of page.

Appendix C

INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED GROUPED BY THE CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION*

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

ALABAMA
Auburn University

ARIZONA
Arizona State University
University of Arizona

CALIFORNIA
Stanford University
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-Irvine
University of California-Los Angeles
University of California-Santa Barbara
University of San Diego

COLORADO
Colorado State University
University of Colorado-Boulder

CONNECTICUT
University of Connecticut

DELAWARE
University of Delaware

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
George Washington University

FLORIDA
Florida State University
University of Florida
University of Miami

GEORGIA
University of Georgia

HAWAII
University of Hawaii-Manoa

ILLINOIS
Northwestern University
University of Chicago
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
University of Illinois-Urbana

INDIANA
Indiana University-Bloomington
Purdue University

IOWA
University of Iowa
Iowa State University

KANSAS
Kansas State University
University of Kansas

KENTUCKY
University of Kentucky

LOUISIANA
Louisiana State University

MARYLAND
Johns Hopkins University
University of Maryland-College Park

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston University
Harvard University
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

MICHIGAN
Michigan State University
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Wayne State University

MINNESOTA
University of Minnesota

MISSISSIPPI
University of Mississippi

MISSOURI
University of Missouri-Columbia

NEBRASKA
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

NEW JERSEY
Rutgers University

*Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987). A *classification of institutions of higher education* (rev. ed.). Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

NEW MEXICO
New Mexico State University
University of New Mexico

NEW YORK
Columbia University
New York University
State University of New York-Albany
State University of New York-Buffalo
Syracuse University
University of Rochester
Yeshiva University

NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina State University
University of North Carolina

OHIO
Ohio State University
University of Cincinnati

OKLAHOMA
Oklahoma State University
University of Oklahoma

OREGON
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA
Pennsylvania State University
Temple University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh

TENNESSEE
University of Tennessee
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

TEXAS
Texas A&M University
University of Texas-Austin

UTAH
University of Utah
Utah State University

VIRGINIA
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

WASHINGTON
University of Washington
Washington State University

WEST VIRGINIA
West Virginia State University

WISCONSIN
University of Wisconsin-Madison

WYOMING
University of Wyoming

CANADA**
University of Alberta

DOCTORATE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

ALABAMA
University of Alabama
University of Alabama-Birmingham

ARIZONA
Northern Arizona University

ARKANSAS
University of Arkansas

CALIFORNIA
Pepperdine University
University of California-Riverside

COLORADO
University of Northern Colorado
University of Denver

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
American University

FLORIDA
Florida Atlantic University
Nova University
University of South Florida

GEORGIA
Atlanta University
Georgia State University

IDAHO
University of Idaho

**Canadian institutions were not included in the Carnegie classification scheme. We used the Carnegie criteria to assign Canadian institutions to the appropriate categories for this analysis.

ILLINOIS
Illinois State University
Loyola University
Northern Illinois University

INDIANA
Ball State University
Indiana State University

IOWA
Drake University

KENTUCKY
University of Louisville

LOUISIANA
University of New Orleans

MAINE
University of Maine

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston College

MICHIGAN
Western Michigan University

MISSISSIPPI
University of Southern Mississippi

MISSOURI
University of Missouri-Kansas City
University of Missouri-St. Louis

MONTANA
Montana State University
University of Montana

NEVADA
University of Nevada-Reno

NEW HAMPSHIRE
University of New Hampshire

NEW YORK
Fordham University-Lincoln Center
Hofstra University
St. John's University

NORTH DAKOTA
University of North Dakota

OHIO
Bowling Green State University
Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio University
University of Akron
University of Toledo

OKLAHOMA
University of Tulsa

OREGON
Portland State University

PENNSYLVANIA
Lehigh University
Duquesne University

SOUTH CAROLINA
Clemson University
University of South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University

TEXAS
Baylor University
East Texas State University
North Texas State University
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
University of Houston

UTAH
Brigham Young University

VERMONT
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA
College of William & Mary
Old Dominion University

WISCONSIN
Marquette University
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

CANADA**
University of Ottawa
University of Saskatchewan

COMPREHENSIVE INSTITUTIONS

ALABAMA
Alabama A&M University
Alabama State University
Auburn University-Montgomery
Jacksonville State University
Livingston University
Samford University
Troy State University-Bay Minette
Troy State University-Ft. Rucker
Troy State University-Maxwell
Tuskegee Institute
University of Alabama-Huntsville
University of Montevallo
University of North Alabama
University of South Alabama

ALASKA
University of Alaska-Anchorage
University of Alaska-Fairbanks
University of Alaska-Juneau

ARKANSAS
Arkansas State University

CALIFORNIA
California State College-San Bernardino
California State University-Dominquez Hills
California State University-Fresno
California State University-Fullerton
California State University-Hayward
California State University-Los Angeles
California State University-Northridge
California State University-Sacramento
Humboldt State University
Mount St. Mary's College
San Diego State University
San Francisco State University
Sonoma State University
University of The Pacific

COLORADO
Western State College of Colorado

CONNECTICUT
Fairfield University
University of Bridgeport

FLORIDA
Florida A&M University
Florida International University
Jacksonville University
Stetson University
University of Central Florida
University of North Florida
University of West Florida

GEORGIA
Columbus College
Georgia Southern College
Valdosta State University
West Georgia College

ILLINOIS
Bradley University
Chicago State University
Concordia College
De Paul University
Eastern Illinois University
Governor's State University
Roosevelt University
Saint Xavier College
Sangamon State University
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Western Illinois University

INDIANA
Butler University
Indiana University-Purdue at Ft. Wayne
University of Evansville

IOWA
Clarke College
Loras College
University of Northern Iowa

KANSAS
Washburn University
Wichita State University

KENTUCKY
Eastern Kentucky University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Northern Kentucky University
Spalding College

**Canadian institutions were not included in the Carnegie classification scheme. We used the Carnegie criteria to assign Canadian institutions to the appropriate categories for this analysis.

Union College
Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA
Centenary College of Louisiana
Grambling State University
Louisiana State University-Shreveport
McNeese State University
Nicholls State University
Northeast Louisiana University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern University
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Xavier University of Louisiana

MAINE
University of Southern Maine

MARYLAND
Bowie State College
Frostburg State College
Loyola College
Morgan State University
Western Maryland College

MASSACHUSETTS
University of Lowell

MICHIGAN
Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Northern Michigan University

MINNESOTA
Bemidji State University
College of St. Thomas
Mankato State University
Saint Cloud State University
Tri-College University
University of Minnesota-Duluth
Winona State University

MISSISSIPPI
Delta State University
Jackson State University

MISSOURI
Central Missouri State University
Northeast Missouri State University
Northwest Missouri State University
St. Louis University
Southeast Missouri State University
Southwest Missouri State University

NEBRASKA
Creighton University
Chadron State College
Kearney State College
Wayne State College
University of Nebraska-Omaha

NEVADA
University of Nevada-Las Vegas

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Rivier College

NEW JERSEY
Georgian Court College
Glassboro State College
Jersey State College
Rider College
Seton Hall University

NEW MEXICO
Eastern New Mexico University
Western New Mexico University
New Mexico Highlands University

NEW YORK
Bank Street College of Education
Baruch College
Canisius College
City University of New York-Brooklyn
City University of New York-Hunter College
City University of New York-Queens
Long Island University
Manhattan College
Niagara University
Pace University
St. Bonaventure University
St. Lawrence University
State University College-Buffalo
State University College-Fredonia
State University College-New Platz
State University College-Plattsburgh
State University of New York-Brockport
State University of New York-Courtland
State University of New York-Oswego

NORTH CAROLINA
Appalachian State University
Campbell University
East Carolina University
North Carolina A&T State University
Pembroke State University
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
University of North Carolina-Wilmington
Western Carolina University

OHIO
Ashland College
Baldwin Wallace College

John Carrol University
University of Dayton
Wright State University
Xavier University

OKLAHOMA
Central State University
East Central Oklahoma State University
Northeastern State University
Phillips University
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University

OREGON
Lewis and Clark College

PENNSYLVANIA
Beaver College
Bucknell University
California State College
Cheyney State College
Edinboro State College
Shippensburg University
University of Scranton
Villanova University
Westminister College

RHODE ISLAND
Rhode Island College
Providence College

SOUTH CAROLINA
Bob Jones University
The Citadel
Furman University
South Carolina State College

SOUTH DAKOTA
South Dakota State University

TENNESSEE
Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga

TEXAS
Abilene Christian University
Angelo State University
Corpus Christi State University
Lamar University
Midwestern State University
Our Lady of The Lake University
Pan American University
Prairie View A&M University
Sam Houston State University
Laredo State University
Southwest Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A&I University
Texas Southern University
Trinity University
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Houston-Victoria
University of Texas-El Paso
University of Texas-San Antonio
West Texas State University

VERMONT
Castleton State College

VIRGINIA
George Mason University
James Madison University
Lynchburg College
Radford University
University of Richmond

WASHINGTON
Central Washington University
Eastern Washington University
Gonzaga University
Pacific Lutheran University
Seattle Pacific University
Seattle University
University of Puget Sound
Western Washington University
Whitworth College

WEST VIRGINIA
Marshall University
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

WISCONSIN
University of Wisconsin-Superior

CANADA**
University of Calgary
Brandon University
University of Manitoba

**Canadian institutions were not included in the Carnegie classification scheme. We used the Carnegie criteria to assign Canadian institutions to the appropriate categories for this analysis.

Appendix D

DEPARTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE BY STATE

State	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Returned	Response Rate %
AL	17	12	70
AK	3	3	100
AZ	3	3	100
AR	2	2	100
CA	22	19	86
CO	5	3	60
CT	3	3	100
DE	1	1	100
DC	2	2	100
FL	13	10	76
GA	7	6	85
HI	1	1	100
ID	1	1	100
IL	18	13	72
IN	7	7	100
IA	6	4	66
KS	4	4	100
KY	9	6	66
LA	13	11	85
ME	2	2	100
MD	7	4	58
MA	5	3	60
MI	7	6	85
MN	8	6	75
MS	4	3	75
MO	9	8	88
MT	2	2	100
NE	6	5	83
NV	2	1	50
NH	2	2	100
NJ	6	5	83
NM	5	3	60
NY	29	20	69
NC	10	8	80
ND	1	1	100
OH	15	13	86
OK	9	6	66
OR	3	3	100
PA	15	11	73
RI	2	2	100
SC	6	4	66
SD	2	2	100
TN	9	8	88
TX	29	25	86
UT	3	2	66
VT	2	2	100
VA	10	7	70
WA	11	9	82
WV	3	2	66
WI	4	4	100
WY	1	1	100
Canada	6	6	100
Total	372	297	80

Appendix E

UCEA MEMBER INSTITUTIONS IN 1986*

University of Alberta
Arizona State University
University of Arkansas
Boston University
State University of New York at Buffalo
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
Fordham University
Georgia State University
Hofstra University
University of Houston
University of Illinois
Illinois State University
Indiana University
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
Kansas State University
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University
University of Maryland
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
New Mexico State University
New York University
Northern Illinois University
The Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
The Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
St. John's University
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
Texas A & M University
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Washington State University
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

*State University of New York at Albany became a UCEA member during the course of this study and was not classified as a UCEA member for data analysis purposes.

Appendix F

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE BY INSTITUTION AND STATE

STATE	INSTITUTION	NO. OF FACULTY Initial No.	Adjusted No.*	COMPLETED FORMS	RESPONSE RATE %
ALABAMA	17				
	Alabama A&M Univ.	7	5	3	60
	Alabama State Univ.	7	6	2	33
	Auburn Univ.	10	9	6	66
	Auburn Univ. Montgomery	2	2	2	100
	Jacksonville State Univ.	13	13	2	15
	Livingston Univ.	1	1	1	100
	Samford Univ.	6	5	1	20
	Troy State Univ. Bay Minette	1	1	0	0
	Troy State Univ. Ft. Rucker	2	2	2	100
	Troy State Univ. Maxwell	9	5	2	40
	Tuskegee Institute	5	2	0	0
	Univ. of Alabama	21	14	6	43
	Univ. of Alabama Birmingham	15	15	5	33
	Univ. of Alabama Huntsville	4	3	0	0
	Univ. of Montevallo	2	2	0	0
	Univ. of North Alabama	5	4	1	25
	Univ. of South Alabama	7	6	4	67
	TOTAL	117	95	37	39
ALASKA	3				
	Univ. of Alaska Anchorage	3	3	2	67
	Univ. of Alaska Fairbanks	6	3	1	33
	Univ. of Alaska Juneau	6	4	1	25
	TOTAL	15	10	4	40
ARIZONA	3				
	Arizona State Univ.	19	15	12	80
	Northern Arizona Univ.	13	11	9	82
	Univ. of Arizona	16	10	5	50
	TOTAL	48	36	26	71
ARKANSAS	2				
	Arkansas State Univ.	7	7	6	86
	Univ. of Arkansas	9	7	5	72
	TOTAL	16	14	11	79
CALIFORNIA	22				
	Cal. State College-San Bernardino	6	4	3	75
	Cal. State Univ.-Dominquez Hills	3	2	0	0
	Cal. State Univ.-Fresno	2	2	2	100
	Cal. State Univ.-Fullerton	7	5	2	40
	Cal. State Univ.-Hayward	6	6	4	67
	Cal. State Univ.-Los Angeles	8	8	6	75
	Cal. State Univ.-Northridge	9	6	3	50
	Cal. State Univ.-Sacramento	10	10	5	50
	Humboldt State Univ.	8	5	1	20
	Mount St. Mary's College	3	2	0	0
	Pepperdine Univ.	17	16	6	37
	San Diego State Univ.	5	4	3	75
	San Francisco State Univ.	5	3	0	0
	Sonoma State Univ.	7	5	0	0
	Stanford Univ.	8	7	3	43
	Univ. of Cal. -Berkeley	8	8	4	50
	Univ. of Cal.-Irvine	6	4	1	25
	Univ. of Cal. -Los Angeles	13	9	5	55
	Univ. of Cal. -Riverside	4	4	3	75
	Univ. of Cal. -Santa Barbara	6	4	2	50
	Univ. of San Diego	5	3	2	67
	Univ. of the Pacific	4	4	3	75
	TOTAL	150	121	58	48
COLORADO	5				
	Colorado State Univ.	6	5	3	60
	Univ. of Colorado	9	8	4	50
	Univ. of Denver	6	3	0	0
	Univ. of Northern Colorado	7	4	3	75
	Western State College of Colorado	4	4	1	25
	TOTAL	32	24	11	46

*The adjusted number reflects 331 questionnaires returned as not applicable and 415 respondents that were eliminated based on the data supplied by the department chairpersons.

CONNECTICUT	3				
	Fairfield Univ.	4	2	0	0
	Univ. of Bridgeport	6	4	2	50
	Univ. of Connecticut	19	14	8	57
	TOTAL	**29**	**20**	**10**	**50**
DELAWARE	1				
	Univ. of Delaware	4	3	2	67
	TOTAL	**4**	**3**	**2**	**67**
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	2				
	American Univ.	7	4	1	25
	George Washington Univ.	10	7	5	71
	TOTAL	**17**	**11**	**6**	**55**
FLORIDA	13				
	Florida A&M Univ.	4	3	1	33
	Florida Atlantic Univ.	10	8	4	50
	Florida International Univ.	11	6	2	33
	Florida State Univ.	20	14	9	64
	Jacksonville Univ.	3	3	0	0
	Nova Univ.	6	5	2	40
	Stetson Univ.	3	2	1	50
	Univ. of Central Florida	6	5	4	80
	Univ. of Florida	19	14	7	50
	Univ. of Miami	7	5	3	60
	Univ. of North Florida	4	4	2	50
	Univ. of South Florida	13	11	7	64
	Univ. of West Florida	9	7	1	14
	TOTAL	**115**	**87**	**43**	**49**
GEORGIA	7				
	Atlanta Univ.	11	8	1	13
	Columbus College	4	2	1	50
	Georgia Southern College	4	3	3	100
	Georgia State Univ.	17	13	10	77
	Univ. of Georgia	14	11	8	73
	Valdosta State Univ.	10	9	8	89
	West Georgia College	4	3	2	67
	TOTAL	**64**	**49**	**33**	**67**
HAWAII	1				
	Univ. of Hawaii	6	6	6	100
	TOTAL	**6**	**6**	**6**	**100**
IDAHO	1				
	Univ. of Idaho	10	7	5	71
	TOTAL	**10**	**7**	**5**	**71**
ILLINOIS	18				
	Bradley Univ.	5	5	2	40
	Chicago State Univ.	7	6	5	83
	Concordia College	4	3	1	33
	De Paul Univ.	2	2	1	50
	Eastern Illinois Univ.	5	5	3	60
	Illinois State Univ.	22	16	11	69
	Governor's State Univ.	3	3	1	33
	Loyola Univ.	11	7	4	57
	Northern Illinois Univ.	15	12	9	75
	Northwestern Univ.	11	7	2	29
	Roosevelt Univ.	19	6	0	0
	Saint Xavier College	8	4	2	50
	Sangamon State Univ.	7	4	2	50
	Southern Illinois Univ. Carbondale	21	16	13	81
	Southern Illinois Univ. Edwardsville	6	6	5	83
	Univ. of Chicago	7	5	1	20
	Univ. of Illinois	14	10	9	90
	Western Illinois Univ.	9	8	7	88
	TOTAL	**176**	**125**	**78**	**62**
INDIANA	7				
	Ball State Univ.	8	7	7	100
	Butler Univ.	8	5	3	60
	Indiana State Univ.	6	5	2	40
	Indiana Univ.	22	17	13	76
	Purdue Univ.	7	7	3	43

	Indiana Univ. Purdue at Ft. Wayne	5	3	2	67
	Univ. of Evansville	4	2	1	50
	TOTAL	**69**	**44**	**31**	**67**
IOWA	6				
	Clarke College	4	2	2	100
	Drake Univ.	7	5	3	60
	Iowa State Univ.	10	10	8	80
	Loras College	2	2	1	50
	Univ. of Iowa	16	11	7	67
	Univ. of Northern Iowa	7	6	2	33
	TOTAL	**46**	**36**	**23**	**64**
KANSAS	4				
	Kansas State Univ.	9	7	4	57
	Univ. of Kansas	14	10	7	70
	Washburn Univ.	5	3	1	33
	Wichita State Univ.	6	5	4	80
	TOTAL	**34**	**25**	**16**	**64**
KENTUCKY	9				
	Eastern Kentucky Univ.	4	4	3	75
	Morehead State Univ.	4	4	3	75
	Murray State Univ.	5	4	3	75
	Northern Kentucky Univ.	2	2	1	50
	Spalding College	3	3	1	33
	Union College	4	4	2	50
	Univ. of Kentucky	7	5	3	60
	Univ. of Louisville	7	6	6	100
	Western Kentucky Univ.	20	12	6	50
	TOTAL	**56**	**44**	**28**	**64**
LOUISIANA	13				
	Centenary College of Louisiana	4	2	1	50
	Grambling State Univ.	14	10	2	20
	Louisiana State Univ.-Baton Rouge	9	7	6	86
	Louisiana State Univ.-Shreveport	7	5	2	40
	McNeese State Univ.	6	6	2	33
	Nicholls State Univ.	5	4	3	75
	Northeast Louisiana Univ.	4	4	3	75
	Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana	6	5	5	100
	Southeastern Louisiana Univ.	7	5	4	80
	Southern Univ.	9	6	0	0
	Univ. of New Orleans	9	8	3	38
	Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana	5	4	2	50
	Xavier Univ. of Louisiana	1	1	1	100
	TOTAL	**86**	**67**	**34**	**51**
MAINE	2				
	Univ. of Maine	8	6	4	67
	Univ. of Southern Maine	8	5	2	40
	TOTAL	**16**	**11**	**6**	**55**
MARYLAND	7				
	Bowie State College	5	5	0	0
	Frostburg State College	3	3	2	67
	Johns Hopkins Univ.	5	3	0	0
	Loyola College	7	4	0	0
	Morgan State Univ.	1	1	1	100
	Univ. of Maryland College Park	28	15	8	53
	Western Maryland College	7	3	1	33
	TOTAL	**56**	**34**	**12**	**35**
MASSACHUSETTS	5				
	Boston College	8	7	1	14
	Boston Univ.	9	6	2	33
	Harvard Univ.	16	11	3	27
	Univ. of Lowell	4	4	1	25
	Univ. of Massachusetts	21	12	5	42
	TOTAL	**58**	**40**	**12**	**30**
MICHIGAN	7				
	Central Michigan Univ.	5	5	4	80
	Eastern Michigan Univ.	5	5	5	100
	Michigan State Univ.	14	12	10	83
	Northern Michigan Univ.	1	1	0	0
	Univ. of Michigan	21	17	6	35

	Wayne State Univ.	10	8	3	38
	Western Michigan Univ.	11	11	5	45
	TOTAL	67	59	33	56
MINNESOTA	8				
	Bemidji State Univ.	4	4	4	100
	College of St. Thomas	6	5	4	80
	Mankato State Univ.	4	4	2	50
	Saint Cloud State Univ.	9	4	0	0
	Tri College Univ.	9	2	2	100
	Univ. of Minnesota	24	14	11	79
	Univ. of Minnesota Duluth	7	7	1	14
	Winona State Univ.	8	4	3	75
	TOTAL	71	44	27	61
MISSISSIPPI	4				
	Delta State Univ.	8	5	3	60
	Jackson State Univ.	6	5	3	60
	Univ. of Mississippi	9	7	5	71
	Univ. of Southern Mississippi	11	7	7	100
	TOTAL	34	24	18	75
MISSOURI	9				
	Central Missouri State Univ.	8	5	4	80
	Northeast Missouri State Univ.	7	5	4	80
	Northwest Missouri State Univ.	4	4	2	50
	Saint Louis Univ.	7	5	3	60
	Southeast Missouri State Univ.	8	6	2	33
	Southwest Missouri State Univ.	6	6	2	33
	Univ. of Missouri Columbia	29	17	9	53
	Univ. of Missouri Kansas City	9	7	4	57
	Univ. of Missouri St. Louis	5	5	2	20
	TOTAL	83	60	32	53
MONTANA	2				
	Montana State Univ.	8	6	6	100
	Univ. of Montana	6	5	3	60
	TOTAL	14	11	9	82
NEBRASKA	6				
	Creighton Univ.	3	3	2	67
	Chadron State College	5	4	3	75
	Kearney State College	4	4	3	75
	Wayne State College	6	6	3	50
	Univ. of Nebraska Lincoln	25	15	11	73
	Univ. of Nebraska Omaha	6	6	5	83
	TOTAL	49	38	27	71
NEVADA	2				
	Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas	4	4	2	50
	Univ. of Nevada Reno	3	3	0	0
	TOTAL	7	7	2	29
NEW HAMPSHIRE	2				
	Rivier College	3	2	1	50
	Univ. of New Hampshire	4	4	1	25
	TOTAL	7	6	2	33
NEW JERSEY	6				
	Georgian Court College	6	4	2	50
	Glassboro State College	9	6	3	50
	Jersey State College	7	4	2	50
	Rider College	6	4	2	50
	Seton Hall Univ.	8	7	3	43
	Rutgers Univ.	11	8	6	75
	TOTAL	47	33	18	55
NEW MEXICO	5				
	Eastern New Mexico Univ.	3	3	2	67
	New Mexico State Univ.	11	7	4	57
	Western New Mexico Univ.	3	2	1	50
	Univ. of New Mexico	14	10	5	50
	New Mexico Highlands	4	4	2	50
	TOTAL	35	26	14	54
NEW YORK	29				
	Bank Street College of Education	12	12	2	17
	Baruch College	5	4	2	50
	Canisius College	9	3	2	67

	City Univ. of New York Brooklyn	6	6	2	33
	City Univ. of New York Hunter College	2	2	1	50
	City Univ. of New York Queens	10	5	3	60
	Columbia Univ.	16	10	4	40
	Fordham Univ. Lincoln Center	14	9	7	77
	Hofstra Univ.	8	6	4	67
	Long Island Univ.	8	6	1	17
	Manhattan College	6	5	2	40
	New York Univ.	15	9	5	56
	Niagara Univ.	10	10	2	20
	Pace Univ.	7	5	3	60
	St. Bonaventure Univ.	3	3	3	100
	St. John's Univ.	12	8	7	88
	St. Lawrence Univ.	5	5	2	40
	State Univ. College Buffalo	3	3	2	67
	State Univ. College Fredonia	2	2	1	50
	State Univ. College New Platz	7	5	2	40
	State Univ. College Plattsburgh	3	2	0	0
	State Univ. of New York Albany	13	13	5	39
	State Univ. of New York Buffalo	19	13	8	62
	State Univ. of New York Brockport	16	10	3	30
	State Univ. of New York Courtland	6	3	1	33
	State Univ. of New York Oswego	2	2	0	0
	Syracuse Univ.	9	7	5	71
	Univ. of Rochester	14	10	6	60
	Yeshiva Univ.	13	7	2	29
	TOTAL	**255**	**185**	**87**	**47**
NORTH CAROLINA	**10**				
	Appalachian State Univ.	15	10	8	80
	Campbell Univ.	5	4	2	50
	East Carolina Univ.	9	7	2	29
	North Carolina A&T State Univ.	6	6	1	17
	North Carolina State Univ.	8	5	0	0
	Pembroke State Univ.	5	5	0	0
	Univ. of North Carolina	7	5	3	60
	Univ. of North Carolina-Charlotte	5	5	3	60
	Univ. of North Carolina-Wilmington	8	7	5	71
	Western Carolina Univ.	7	7	5	71
	TOTAL	**75**	**61**	**29**	**48**
NORTH DAKOTA	**1**				
	Univ. of North Dakota	7	7	6	86
	TOTAL	**7**	**7**	**6**	**86**
OHIO	**15**				
	Ashland College	7	5	1	20
	Baldwin Wallace College	9	4	1	25
	Bowling Green State Univ.	19	14	7	50
	Cleveland State Univ.	9	6	4	67
	John Carrol Univ.	9	6	2	33
	Kent State Univ.	11	8	3	27
	Miami Univ.	16	11	9	82
	Ohio State Univ.	21	14	8	57
	Ohio Univ.	6	5	2	40
	Univ. of Akron	8	6	5	83
	Univ. of Cincinnati	9	7	2	29
	Univ. of Dayton	8	7	5	71
	Univ. of Toledo	22	11	7	64
	Wright State Univ.	11	9	5	56
	Xavier Univ.	6	5	4	80
	TOTAL	**171**	**118**	**65**	**55**
OKLAHOMA	**9**				
	Central State Univ.	4	4	2	50
	East Central Oklahoma State Univ.	5	3	2	67
	Northeastern State Univ.	6	6	4	67
	Oklahoma State Univ.	17	11	9	81
	Phillips Univ.	5	4	1	25
	Southeastern Oklahoma State Univ.	9	8	3	38
	Southwestern Oklahoma State Univ.	10	9	6	67
	Univ. of Oklahoma	12	12	7	53
	Univ. of Tulsa	6	5	5	100
	TOTAL	**74**	**62**	**39**	**63**
OREGON	**3**				
	Lewis and Clark College	7	5	2	40
	Portland State Univ.	8	6	3	50
	Univ. of Oregon	23	15	7	47
	TOTAL	**38**	**26**	**12**	**46**

PENNSYLVANIA	**15**				
	Beaver College	6	3	1	33
	Bucknell Univ.	5	4	2	50
	California State College	3	2	2	100
	Cheyney State College	6	6	1	17
	Duquesne Univ.	5	3	2	67
	Edinboro State College	3	2	1	50
	Lehigh Univ.	6	5	2	40
	Pennsylvania State Univ.	21	12	9	75
	Shippensburg Univ.	4	4	1	25
	Temple Univ.	8	7	4	57
	Univ. of Pennsylvania	8	7	3	43
	Univ. of Pittsburgh	16	15	4	27
	Univ. of Scranton	4	2	0	0
	Villanova Univ.	3	3	1	33
	Westminster College	6	4	4	100
	TOTAL	**102**	**79**	**37**	**47**
RHODE ISLAND	**2**				
	Rhode Island College	8	4	0	0
	Providence College	3	3	3	100
	TOTAL	**11**	**7**	**3**	**43**
SOUTH CAROLINA	**6**				
	Bob Jones Univ.	9	6	2	33
	The Citadel	3	3	2	67
	Clemson Univ.	4	4	1	25
	Furman Univ.	5	4	3	75
	South Carolina State College	4	4	0	0
	Univ. of South Carolina	18	14	11	79
	TOTAL	**43**	**35**	**19**	**54**
SOUTH DAKOTA	**2**				
	South Dakota State Univ.	4	4	2	50
	Univ. of South Dakota	7	6	4	67
	TOTAL	**11**	**10**	**6**	**60**
TENNESSEE	**9**				
	Austin Peay State Univ.	2	2	2	100
	East Tennessee State Univ.	7	6	5	83
	Peabody College of Vanderbilt Univ.	20	15	9	60
	Memphis State Univ.	10	8	6	75
	Middle Tennessee State Univ.	7	6	3	50
	Tennessee State Univ.	13	10	4	40
	Tennessee Tech Univ.	10	7	2	29
	Univ. of Tennessee-Knoxville	14	13	9	69
	Univ. of Tennessee-Chattanooga	6	6	4	67
	TOTAL	**89**	**73**	**44**	**60**
TEXAS	**29**				
	Abilene Christian Univ.	4	4	3	75
	Angelo State Univ.	5	4	0	0
	Baylor Univ.	8	5	1	20
	Corpus Christi State Univ.	5	5	3	60
	East Texas State Univ.	11	9	6	67
	Lamar Univ.	5	4	2	50
	Midwestern State Univ.	3	3	1	33
	North Texas State Univ.	17	16	10	63
	Our Lady of the Lake Univ.	4	3	2	67
	Pan American Univ.	6	6	3	50
	Prairie View A&M Univ.	7	5	2	40
	Sam Houston State Univ.	7	6	5	83
	Laredo State Univ.	4	4	3	75
	Southwest Texas State Univ.	9	9	8	89
	Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	12	8	3	38
	Tarleton State Univ.	9	6	3	50
	Texas A&I Univ.	7	5	4	80
	Texas A&M Univ.	25	18	14	78
	Texas Southern Univ.	13	10	7	70
	Texas Tech Univ.	8	7	5	71
	Texas Women's Univ.	8	6	3	50
	Trinity Univ.	4	3	2	67
	Univ. of Houston	17	14	11	79
	Univ. of Houston-Clear Lake	6	5	3	60
	Univ. of Houston-Victoria	3	3	2	67
	Univ. of Texas-Austin	19	15	12	80
	Univ. of Texas-El Paso	5	5	3	60
	Univ. of Texas-San Antonio	3	3	2	67
	West Texas State Univ.	5	3	1	33
	TOTAL	**239**	**184**	**134**	**67**

UTAH	3				
	Brigham Young Univ.	9	8	5	63
	Utah State Univ.	9	6	3	50
	Univ. of Utah	17	13	12	92
	TOTAL	35	27	20	74
VERMONT	2				
	Carleton State College	3	1	0	0
	Univ. of Vermont	9	7	5	71
	TOTAL	12	8	5	63
VIRGINIA	10				
	College of William and Mary	7	5	3	60
	George Mason Univ.	6	3	1	33
	James Madison Univ.	2	2	1	50
	Lynchburg College	4	3	2	67
	Old Dominion Univ.	14	7	3	43
	Radford Univ.	7	7	3	43
	Univ. of Richmond	6	3	0	0
	Univ. of Virginia	18	14	11	79
	Virginia Commonwealth Univ.	4	3	3	100
	Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	22	17	8	47
	TOTAL	90	64	35	55
WASHINGTON	11				
	Central Washington Univ.	6	5	2	40
	Eastern Washington Univ.	2	2	1	50
	Gonzaga Univ.	10	6	4	67
	Pacific Lutheran Univ.	4	3	3	100
	Seattle Pacific Univ.	7	5	3	60
	Seattle Univ.	9	6	4	67
	Univ. of Puget Sound	5	5	1	20
	Univ. of Washington	10	7	4	57
	Washington State Univ.	13	10	7	70
	Western Washington Univ.	4	4	1	25
	Whitworth College	7	4	0	0
	TOTAL	77	57	30	53
WEST VIRGINIA	3				
	Marshall Univ.	5	5	2	40
	West Virginia College of Grad. Stud.	5	5	1	20
	West Virginia Univ.	16	15	7	47
	TOTAL	26	25	10	40
WISCONSIN	4				
	Marquette Univ.	2	2	1	50
	Univ. of Wisconsin Madison	15	12	11	92
	Univ. of Wisconsin Milwaukee	11	8	6	75
	Univ. of Wisconsin Superior	7	7	6	86
	TOTAL	35	29	24	83
WYOMING	1				
	Univ. of Wyoming	6	5	1	20
	TOTAL	6	5	1	20
CANADA	6				
	Univ. of Alberta	23	20	15	75
	Univ. of Calgary	6	4	3	75
	Brandon Univ.	4	3	2	67
	Univ. of Manitoba	9	7	3	43
	Univ. of Ottawa	13	11	4	36
	Univ. of Saskatchewan	11	10	10	100
	TOTAL	66	55	37	67
TOTAL	373	3,087	2,341	1,307**	56

**5 questionnaires were received too late to be included in the analyses.

Appendix G

Comparison of Data from Sample of Nonrespondents[a] with Data Supplied by Department Chairpersons and Faculty Respondents

	Data from Sample of Nonrespondents (N=32)		Data from Department Chairpersons (N=297)		Data from Faculty Respondents (N=1,302)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Target Population						
Educational administration faculty member	22	68.8				
Not an educational administration faculty member	10	31.3				
Gender						
Male	19	86.4	1,423	87.9	1,148	89.5
Female	3	13.6	196	12.1	135	10.6
Did not identify	—	—	—		7	.5
Race						
Minority	2	9.0	135	8.3	86	6.7
Caucasian	19	86.6	1,484	91.7	1,197	93.4
Did not identify	1	4.6	—	—	18	1.4
Rank						
Professor	15	68.2	971	60.0	773	59.4
Associate professor	4	18.2	451	27.9	353	27.1
Assistant professor	2	9.0	197	12.2	135	10.4
Other or no response	1	4.6	—	—	41	3.2
Tenure Status						
Tenured	18	81.8	1,303	80.5	956	73.4
Nontenured or no response	4	18.1	316	19.5	346	26.6
Professorial Function of Primary Strength[b]						
Teaching	15	68.1			881	67.7
Research	3	13.6			184	14.1
Service	4	18.1			183	14.1
No response	—	—			54	4.1
Perceived Quality of Own Preparation Program[b]						
Excellent	8	36.6			361	27.7
Good	10	45.5			676	51.9
Fair	3	13.6			204	15.7
Poor	—	—			27	2.1
No response	1	4.6			34	2.6

[a]Data were collected through telephone interviews with randomly selected nonrespondents. Responses to 7 of the 15 items in the interview guide are reflected here.
[b]These items were not included on the questionnaire sent to department chairpersons.

Appendix H

Selected Discriminant Analysis Tables

Table H-1 Discriminant Analysis on K-12 and Higher Education Faculty

Discriminating Variables	K-12 (N=471) *M*	SD	Higher Education (N=96) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities							
Time spent teaching graduate students	42.49	21.99	33.30	20.32	.31	E-01	.68
Time spent teaching undergraduates	5.48	13.88	3.27	9.83	.38	E-01	.51
Time spent consulting	8.48	8.94	5.45	6.50	.59	E-01	.50
Time spent in committee work	6.87	7.84	5.95	6.05	.44	E-01	.33
Time spent in university administration	13.50	21.86	20.86	30.37	.13	E-01	.32
Articles/books written/co-authored	9.18	10.44	9.81	11.31	.20	E-01	.21
Attitudes							
Satisfaction with research	2.92	1.06	2.67	1.07	.26		.27
Satisfaction with current salary	2.82	1.21	2.48	1.26	.21		.26
Poor intellectual climate in department is a problem	3.05	0.94	2.48	1.04	.29		.21
Increase in off-campus teaching is a problem	3.23	0.91	3.35	0.91	-.22		-.20
Satisfaction with colleagues' caliber	2.49	1.07	2.75	1.20	-.25		-.27
Other							
Age entered professorship	37.18	6.67	34.04	6.75	.60	E-01	.40
Group Centroids							
K-12						.16	
Higher Education						-.80	

Classification Analysis	% of Cases Correctly Classified	
K-12	70.80	29.20
Higher Education	41.20	58.80
Ungrouped cases	58.80	41.30
	68.65% Correctly Classified	

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	x^2	D.F.	Significance
	.1294	.3384	.8855	68.05	12	.0005

Table II-2 Discriminant Analysis on Male and Female Faculty

Discriminating Variables	Male (N=619) *M*	SD	Female (N=141) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities							
Time spent supervising doctoral work	10.23	10.35	7.02	7.49	.15	E-01	.15
Time spent in committee work	6.65	7.45	8.24	8.64	-.15	E-01	-.12
Time spent teaching graduate students	40.81	21.99	40.68	20.21	-.69	E-02	-.15
Time spent on research and writing	11.85	12.18	19.73	14.10	-.25	E-01	-.32
Attitudes							
Satisfaction with graduate student quality	2.52	0.95	2.66	0.86	.17		.16
Increase in off-campus teaching is a problem	3.28	0.89	3.03	1.03	.15		.14
Faculty should participate in meetings	1.98	0.79	1.81	0.84	.15		.12
Former practitioners make the best faculty	2.93	1.31	3.41	1.26	-.10		-.13
Satisfaction with present position	1.86	1.02	2.27	1.16	-.25		-.27
Other							
Present age	52.11	7.83	43.24	7.45	.11		.84
External income	3.41	2.33	2.85	1.83	.86	E-01	.22
Age entered professorship	36.40	6.86	36.37	6.30	-.68	E-01	-.46

Group Centroids					
Male			.14		
Female			-1.39		
Classification Analysis	% of Cases Correctly Classified				
Male	81.00	19.00			
Female	31.90	68.10			
	79.69% Correctly Classified				
Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	x^2	D.F.	Significance
	.1969	.4056	.8355	113.66	13	.0005

Table H-3 Discriminant Analysis on Characteristics of Faculty at UCEA-Member and Non-UCEA Institutions

Discriminating Variables	UCEA (N=187) *M*	SD	Non-UCEA (N=466) *M*	SD	Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities						
Time spent supervising doctoral work	14.89	9.22	8.31	10.53	.05	.55
Time spent on research and writing	16.42	13.89	11.00	12.15	.02	.23
Time spent on "other" activities	2.16	8.39	1.74	7.25	.02	.13
Number of teaching hours each semester	6.34	5.35	7.83	5.26	-.04	-.19
Attitudes						
Former practitioners make the best professors	3.54	1.19	2.71	1.28	.34	.43
Likely to leave academe	4.20	1.09	3.90	1.28	.16	.20
Pressure for proposals and funding is a problem	3.11	0.91	2.97	0.97	.17	.16
Low quality of discourse at professional meetings is a problem	3.01	0.88	2.99	0.93	.13	.12
Satisfied with dept. structure	2.59	1.16	2.74	1.17	.11	-.13
Low salary level in dept. is a problem	2.74	0.94	2.66	0.98	-.16	-.16
Scholars in related fields make the best professors	3.05	1.05	3.40	1.05	-.15	-.16
Lack of able students is a problem	2.74	0.95	2.96	0.91	-.18	-.17
Other						
Current academic salary	6.25	1.87	5.42	1.81	.20	.37

Group Centroids						
UCEA					.81	
Non-UCEA					-.32	
Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership					
UCEA	66.30		37.70			
Non-UCEA	27.70		72.30			
	70.66% of Cases Correctly Classified					
Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	x^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.262	.455	.792	150.14	13	.001

Table 11-4 Discriminant Analysis on Professional Characteristics of Faculty at Research, Doctorate-Granting, and Comprehensive Institutions

Discriminating Variables	Research (N=230) *M*	SD	Doctorate Granting (N=150) *M*	SD	Comprehensive (N=273) *M*	SD	Function 1 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Function 1 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 2 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficients	Function 2 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients
Activities										
Time spent supervising doctoral work	14.44	9.33	13.28	8.80	4.94	10.26	.07	.70	.04	.37
Time spent on research and writing	16.35	15.40	12.05	10.79	9.64	10.71	.02	.25	.00	.05
Time spent on "other" activities	2.14	8.29	1.96	7.27	1.57	7.15	.02	.16	.02	.12
Time spent in university administration	14.46	23.75	14.81	23.73	16.44	24.82	.00	.02	.01	.28
Number of books written or edited	4.57	6.82	3.75	5.99	3.95	8.24	.01	.10	.01	.09
Time spent teaching undergraduate students	2.28	8.50	3.76	10.92	9.21	16.07	.01	.13	.00	.02
Attitudes										
Former practitioners make the best professors	3.44	1.19	2.89	1.37	3.44	1.25	.24	.31	.11	.14
Poor intellectual climate in department is a problem	2.90	1.03	3.03	.97	3.01	.98	.17	.17	.16	.16
Likely to leave academe	4.10	1.12	3.93	1.31	3.93	1.29	.13	.16	.12	.15
Satisfied with colleagues' caliber	2.68	1.17	2.39	.95	2.49	1.02	.14	.14	.37	.39
Lack of able students is a problem	2.82	.97	3.06	.88	2.88	.91	.12	.11	.30	.27
Field studies strengthen practice	2.35	.92	2.43	.94	2.28	.88	.01	.01	.30	.27
Increase in off campus teaching is a problem	3.28	.83	3.11	.98	3.33	.91	.06	.05	.28	.25
Pressure for proposals and funding is a problem	2.98	.99	2.87	1.02	3.12	.90	.09	.09	.21	.20
Need more emphasis on qualitative research	2.38	.99	2.30	1.01	2.51	1.00	.10	.10	.30	.30
Scholars in related fields make the best professors	3.01	1.05	3.52	1.13	3.44	1.00	.18	.18	.43	.45
Pulsies of academic life is a problem	2.61	1.03	2.59	1.02	2.68	.99	.21	.21	.04	.04
Other										
Current academic salary	6.13	1.85	5.64	1.79	5.27	1.84	.16	.29	.09	.15
Area of primary strength	1.62	.77	1.47	.77	1.35	.70	.20	.22	.06	.05
Baccalaureate school income	3.70	2.42	4.57	2.39	4.01	2.29	.04	.10	.16	.38
Teaching hours in a term	6.46	4.99	7.86	7.80	7.96	3.57	.03	.14	.05	.24
Group Centroids								.76		.22
Research								.19		.55
Doctorate granting								.74		.12
Comprehensive										

Classification Analysis

Percent of Cases Correctly Classified

Research	59.7	25.1	16.2
Doctorate granting	27.7	44.9	27.4
Comprehensive	15.5	13.8	70.7

61.75% Correctly Classified

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	χ^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.44	.56	.63	292.74	42	.001
Function 2	.09	.29	.91	97.51	20	.001

Table B-5 Discriminant Analysis on Perceived Orientation of Preparation Program

Discriminating Variables	Preparing Practitioners (N=310) M	SD	Preparing Professors and Researchers (N=44) M	SD	Equally Balanced (N=221) M	SD	Function 1 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Function 1 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient	Function 2 Unstandardized Discriminant Function Coefficient		Function 2 Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficient
Activities												
Time spent consulting	8.59	8.66	4.59	5.34	7.22	8.32	.24	E-01	.21	-.25	E-01	-.21
Time spent teaching undergraduate students	6.42	14.85	7.55	17.78	2.78	8.74	.17	E-01	.15	.38	E-01	.49
Time spent teaching graduate students	43.45	21.93	28.55	15.44	38.61	20.98	.62	E-02	.13	-.68	E-02	-.14
Time spent supervising doctoral work	8.56	10.37	12.11	8.83	11.52	9.48	-.16	E-01	-.16	-.92	E-02	-.09
Time spent on research and writing	8.83	8.94	23.14	19.35	16.81	13.64	-.28	E-01	-.34	.80	E-02	.10
Attitudes												
Satisfied with emphasis on research	2.93	0.98	2.39	1.15	2.81	1.21	.20		.22	-.35		.38
Need higher standards for graduate admissions	3.15	1.16	2.70	1.23	2.67	1.15	.19		.22	.40		.46
Faculty should participate in professional meetings	2.05	0.80	1.89	0.87	1.86	0.78	.19		.15	.33		.27
Poor intellectual climate in department is a problem	3.15	0.92	2.52	1.07	2.87	1.02	.15		.15	-.87	E-01	-.08
Satisfied with colleagues' caliber	2.58	1.03	3.14	1.19	2.79	1.14	.14		.12	.42		.45
Best faculty are leaving academe	3.31	0.86	3.32	0.77	3.15	0.92	.10		.09	.35		.31
Satisfied with present position	1.82	0.98	1.95	1.14	1.99	1.09	-.23	E-01	-.02	-.40		-.40
Field studies strengthen practice	2.25	0.87	2.55	1.04	2.46	0.94	-.12		-.11	-.19		-.17
Satisfied with dept. structure	2.58	1.18	3.14	1.07	2.79	1.24	-.14		-.16	.18		.22
Satisfied with graduate student quality	2.37	0.87	3.05	1.01	2.67	0.98	-.26		-.19	.34		.32
Former practitioners make the best professors	3.15	1.20	2.70	1.03	2.67	1.22	-.43		-.51	-.14		-.17
Group Centroids												
Preparing Practitioners							.54			.06		
Preparing Professors and Researchers							-1.27			.71		
Equally Balanced Program							.55			-.23		
Classification Analysis	Predicted Group Membership											
Preparing Practitioners	71.30	8.50	20.20									
Preparing Professors and Researchers	18.30	45.10	36.60									
Equally Balanced Program	32.60	21.40	46.60									
Ungrouped Cases	59.20	12.20	28.60									
	60.09% of cases correctly classified											

Canonical Discriminant Function	Eigenvalue	Correlation	Wilks lambda	χ^2	D.F.	Significance
Function 1	.420	.544	.633	231.53	34	.001
Function 2	.062	.241	.942	33.88	16	.01

Appendix I

Factor Analysis on Faculty Research Activities

	Factor Matrix (Varimax Rotation)			
Variables	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Commonality Estimates
Time spent on research and writing	.55*	.04	.36	.43
Books and monographs written	.05	.01	.29	.09
Number of articles and papers written	.24*	.07	.40	.22
Research as area of primary strength	.72*	.06	.13	.54
Preparing researchers/professors is preferred orientation of graduate program	.47*	.01	.18	.26
Teach research methods course	.03	.07	.01	.01
Time spent editing journals	.19	.98*	.10	.99
Receiving external funds	.13	.03	.38*	.16
Eigenvalue	1.06	1.04	.25	
Proportion of variance accounted for	13.20	17.50	3.20	

*Indicates those items loading on the respective factor.

Martha M. McCarthy is Professor of Educational Administration and Director, Consortium on Educational Policy Studies at Indiana University.

George D. Kuh is Professor of Higher Education Administration and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, in the School of Education at Indiana University.

L. Jackson Newell is Professor of Higher Education and Dean of Liberal Education at the University of Utah.

Carla M. Iacona is Dean of Students at Rogers High School in Michigan City, Indiana.